

other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

207. Also, petition of 60 residents of Bloomingdale, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

208. Also, petition of 94 residents of Gobles, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

209. Also, petition of 102 residents of Bangor, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

210. Also, petition of 13 residents of Nashville, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

211. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of adult citizens of Eagle Bend, Minn., against passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

212. Also, petition of adult residents of Aitkin County, Minn., against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

213. Also, petition of adult residents of Aitkin, Minn., against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

214. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Mrs. J. M. Carnahan and 59 other residents of Glenwood, Minn., protesting against enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation or of any bills dealing with national religious problems; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

215. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Meeker County, State of Minnesota, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

216. Also, petition of Mary Lindahl, Kensington, Minn., and 19 residents of Traverse and Douglas Counties, Minn., protesting against enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

217. Also, petition of Mrs. William Stoltz and 42 residents of Pope and Grant Counties, Minn., remonstrating against enactment of any legislation designed to enforce Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

218. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Fond du Lac County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

219. By Mr. MAPES: Petition signed by 283 adult citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other national religious legislation which may be pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

220. Also, petition of numerous adults, residents of Grand Rapids, Bedford, Battle Creek, Cloverdale, Doster, Dowling, Jackson, Urbandale, Cadillac, Wellston, Dublin, White Cloud, Muskegon, Fremont, Michigan City, Irons, Baldwin, Peacock, Empire, Harrietta, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other national religious legislation which may be pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

221. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, Munith, and Hudson, Mich., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

222. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., relating to the inclusion of motor-propelled vessels under the regulations of the Steamboat Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

223. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition against tax on Chautauqua tickets, signed by Dr. J. B. Cole et al.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

224. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of J. P. Gaede, 27 Charles Street, Jersey City, N. J., and 500 others, protesting against House bill 78, otherwise known as the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

225. Also, petition of J. Marion Campbell, of 56 Atlantic Street, Jersey City, N. J., protesting against House bill 78, known as the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

226. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Actors Equity Association of New York City, favoring the removal of the tax on spoken drama; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, December 16, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

He that cometh unto Thee with an honest heart, blessed Heavenly Father, Thou wilt surely harken. Encourage us to draw near with our needs, with our limitations, and with our appeals for wisdom. Make us able to bear the vision of the truth and may we have the determination to dedicate ourselves to it. Oh, the love of truth secures ineffable peace, when the flower of life's summer lies withered and dead. We would not seek love of praise, hope of gain, nor delusive happiness, but the stability and the good of the Republic. May Thy plan and purpose be shadowed in our deliberations. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE RESOLUTION RESPECTING REPRESENTATIVE JAMES M. BECK

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a rather humorous error which I think should be corrected. Whether it is in the Journal or the Record or in both I can not say, but here is the matter.

There came to me from the document room a few moments ago House Resolution 1, which purports to have been introduced on December 5, 1927, by "Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee," and it reads as follows:

Resolved, That the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] be now permitted to take the oath of office.

[Laughter.]

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced a resolution touching that subject, but that was not the tenor of my resolution. My recollection is that the resolution which I have just read was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], and in view of the fact that that is the only matter upon which we have had a roll call in which the Republicans have won a victory during this Congress, I think it ought to be credited where credit is due, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. Therefore I ask that the Journal be corrected, if the error be there.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, both the Journal and the Record will be corrected.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose the Speaker has no authority to order the print of this resolution destroyed.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the resolution is in proper form. The original Resolution No. 1 was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and was amended by way of substitute by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. The resolution as amended was passed. That was Mr. GARRETT's resolution amended.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the resolution, so far as I know, which was introduced by myself, has not been printed in bill form. This which I hold in my hand is printed in bill form. I do not understand that you can attribute to me a resolution which I never introduced at all. I do not know what the Journal shows about this matter, because I have not had an opportunity to look at it.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The resolution should show how the gentleman introduced it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is that the resolution as introduced, or the resolution that passed?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This shows the introduction of the resolution and not the passage.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman from Tennessee introduced a resolution, No. 1, and the resolution itself, it seems to me, ought to show the language introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee and the amendment placed on it by the House. That is the only way in which you can properly reflect it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The theory, of course, is that the resolution was dropped in the basket.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And thereafter on the floor an amendment was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. Therefore the original printing should be in the form in which the gentleman from Tennessee presented it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course I do not know whether the resolution that I introduced has been printed in bill form or not. The Record shows the text of the resolution

that I introduced. There ought not to be a print in bill form showing the introduction by a Member of a resolution that he never introduced at all.

The SPEAKER. The resolution might be printed in the form in which it was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There could be a star print making it correct.

The SPEAKER. Which would show the resolution that was introduced originally by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want done whatever is necessary to give the gentleman from New York credit, because there credit is due, and to eliminate me as the author of this resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Is not the gentleman from Tennessee unduly solicitous this morning about giving credit to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think the author of a resolution is entitled to credit for it.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Tennessee recognizes his resolving clause, does he not? So much of the gentleman's original resolution was left and all the rest stricken out.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. All I see here that I recognize is "Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee" and the word "Resolved." [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will confer with the clerks as to the best method of making the correction.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 70

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

Senate Resolution 72

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Edwin P. Thayer, of Indiana, as Secretary of the Senate.

BRIDGE ACROSS BAY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the bill (H. R. 7467) granting to the city and county of San Francisco a permit to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill, in the city and county of San Francisco, to a point near the south mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, State of California, which bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a communication from the city and county of San Francisco in respect to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an official communication from the city of San Francisco with reference to the bridge about which he has introduced a bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long is this?

Mr. WELCH of California. It is very brief—four small pages.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has it been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. WELCH of California. It has.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is a rather unusual thing, Mr. Speaker, to have propaganda resolutions put in the RECORD. I will not object, although it is a rather bad practice.

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will yield, this contains the conditions under which the city of San Francisco desires to build this bridge?

Mr. WELCH of California. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me, I extend my remarks by inserting a communication from the city of San Francisco.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
CLERK'S OFFICE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
December 14, 1927.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, by resolution adopted in regular meeting December 5, 1927, authorized me as chairman of the bridge committee of said board to deliver to you with a request for presentation to the Seventieth Congress of the United States a bill granting to the city and county of San Francisco a permit to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill, in the city and county of San Francisco, to a point near the south mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, State of California.

In accordance with the instructions contained in said resolution, I herewith hand to you a certified copy of the proposed bill and respectfully request that you introduce the same in the Congress. I also hand to you herewith a certified copy of the report of Robert Ridgway, Arthur N. Talbot, and John D. Galloway, board of engineers, which report is referred to in said proposed bill as being on file in the office of the Secretary of War of the United States.

In support of its application for a permit to construct a transbay bridge, San Francisco cites the following reasons:

1. The bridge is necessary for the safety and convenience of the public.
2. The bridge is indispensable to the financial and economic growth of northern California.

In amplification of the above, permit me to call attention to the following facts:

San Francisco Bay is overcrowded with ferries. Shipping in San Francisco Bay is second in point of volume only to that of the harbor of New York. Over 11,000 vessels passed into and out of the harbor last year. Eighteen lines of ferries, making an aggregate of over 850 crossings daily, convey 50,000 people over the bay twice a day across the main lines of commercial shipping. In 1926 ferry trips of interurban type between San Francisco and Eastbay cities numbered 43,550,078; main-line passenger trips numbered 1,686,518. This bay ferry traffic creates a navigation menace. The menace is great and is constantly increasing. It is enhanced by frequent and sometimes very heavy fogs. The time required to cross the bay by ferry, 18 minutes, is unduly long. This constitutes a distinct detriment to business and a grave hardship upon business people. Automobile traffic, now so important to the growth of city and State, is impeded. In 1926 over 2,500,000 automobiles were transported by ferry between Oakland and San Francisco. Congestion of automobiles in highway approaches to and from the city is frequent and often acute. San Francisco and adjacent cities and towns of the peninsula suffer from lack of direct and unbroken road connections with highways across the bay.

The bridge as planned by a board of engineers, the personnel of which was recommended by the presidents of four universities of the State of California, represents months of intensive study. It will be of double deck and will accommodate foot and vehicular travel as well as suburban trains to which may be diverted traffic from all main lines of passenger transportation. It will be 12,000 feet long, will have 20 spans, 2 of these with horizontal clearance of 1,250 feet each. It will have a vertical clearance of 150 feet over 2½ miles of deep water of the bay. This vertical clearance is 15 feet greater than that of the four bridges over the East River at New York and the Philadelphia-Camden Bridge over the Delaware River. There will be one movable span which it is expected will be used only on rare occasions. Shipping men are agreed that the bridge will not interfere with shipping. Indeed they approve of and urge the bridge on the ground that it will be an aid to shipping. The bridge will not interfere with the proposed United States naval base at Alameda. The city of Alameda, by proper resolution, has indorsed the proposed bridge and is joining in the application for a permit to construct the bridge at the location specified. There will be no interference with Oakland Harbor or with present plans for the development of that harbor. On the San Francisco side of the bay most of the wharves, and by far the largest wharves, lie north of the bridge and are not affected thereby. The members of the board of engineers are emphatic in saying in their report that there will be "no interference with shipping in any part of the bay." San Francisco Bay, with its area of 463 square miles, is one of the largest natural harbors on the globe; the area of deep water available for anchorage is sufficient to accommodate the navies of the world. Clearances provided by the proposed bridge are more than sufficient to pass the largest ships in the United States Navy. The line of the bridge crosses over the northern portion of the United States Fleet anchorage as that anchorage is depicted on paper; this can be obviated by moving this anchorage about 1,000 yards southward where ample deep-water anchorage exists.

Within the last two years 26 applications for a franchise to construct a bridge across the bay have been made to the board of supervisors of San Francisco. Perhaps every possible route and every possible type

of bridge have been suggested. Voluminous maps, drawings, engineering digests and blue prints have been filed. Discussion of and arguments on these various applications progressed before the board of supervisors for over six months. Many noteworthy engineers prepared or contributed to the plans and discussions. The entire subject matter, therefore, has been inquired into most exhaustively. Much money has been spent in research. San Francisco itself has spent some \$50,000 of municipal moneys in an endeavor to determine the very best type of bridge and the very best location. It is the sincere belief of city officials that the bridge as now planned between Rincon Hill and Alameda Mole represents the very best of engineering advice and legal counsel.

This San Francisco transbay bridge enterprise is neither provincial in its conception nor local in its significance. San Francisco is the financial center of the great Pacific coast. Her bank clearings are greater than those of any city west of Chicago. Nearly 2,000,000 of people are concentrated within 50 miles of her borders. With her destiny is bound up vitally the destiny of many, if not most, of the populous communities of the West. Her success is their success; her prosperity is their prosperity. The transbay bridge will promote the growth and serve the convenience of them all. Indeed, it is the expectation and the hope that it will be of service and advantage to the entire country. The Chief Executive of this Nation in one of his first and most important utterances since the opening of the present Congress stressed the fact that "It can not be too often said that this is all one country, agriculture, industry, transportation, and finance should realize." He stated, "That they are interdependent and that each may prosper by extending its services to the others."

San Francisco wants to extend its services to others in this matter of transportation. She wants to make straight and safe the path that leads to her door. She is not fearful of the financial burden that she may have to bear or the construction problems that she may have to solve. She is serene in her confidence that she can meet all these. She wants to be brought into closer contact with her sister cities and towns of the Nation; she wants these cities and towns to be brought into closer contact with her. She aspires to make contribution to the convenience, safety, and prosperity of the people of city, State, and Nation. Her aspirations have been fostered and encouraged by the entire State of California; they have received particular encouragement from the people of northern California.

The cities and towns of the entire San Francisco Bay region are in complete accordance with her bridge plan and route. From no civic body, from no political subdivision, from no commercial organization has come any word of dissent. San Francisco has the hearty and undivided cooperation of her sister cities. All she now asks is congressional permission as defined in the accompanying bill. Granted this she will proceed with all possible expedition to construct across San Francisco Bay a bridge which will serve millions of people of the present generation and anticipate the needs of added millions of people of generations to come.

Very sincerely yours,

JAS. M. SHEEHY.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 5800, the first deficiency appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 28, 29, 30, 38, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 24 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Oklahoma," insert the following: "are authorized to execute and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out and at the end of the matter so restored, after the numerals "1925," insert the following: "Provided, That the inmates of the United States Industrial Reformatory shall be employed only in the production and manufacture of supplies for the United States Government, for consumption in United States institutions, and in duties necessary for the construction and maintenance of the institution"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the sum \$370,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 19, 23, 32, 33, 34, 36, and 37.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WILL R. WOOD,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
LEE S. OVERMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for expenses of the Senate in the amounts and in the manner provided by the Senate amendments.

On No. 10: Appropriates \$5,500 for maintenance of the House Office Building for the fiscal year 1928, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 11: Strikes out the appropriation of \$100,000, inserted by the Senate, for the construction of roads in the Virgin Islands.

On No. 12: Appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for administration of the produce agency act.

On No. 13: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the parlatoria date scale.

On No. 14: Appropriates \$869.80, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$815, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims under the Department of Commerce.

On No. 15: Appropriates \$609.52, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$584.79, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims by the Lighthouse Service.

On No. 16: Extends the availability of the appropriation for repair of the fish hatchery at Springville, Utah, to the fiscal year 1929, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 17 and 18: Relating to the claim of the Shawnee Indians and certain Delaware Indians: Appropriates \$463,732.49 for payment of the claims of these Indians, as proposed by both Houses, but accepts the language of the Senate appropriating specifically and directly for the payment of the claim without any reference to House bill 5218 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, as embodied in the language of the House bill.

On No. 20: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to determine the property loss by flood sustained by certain property owners residing at or in the vicinity of Hatch and Santa Teresa, N. Mex.

On No. 21: Restores the appropriation of \$100,000 for facilities at the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, stricken out by the Senate, modified in such manner as to limit the employment of inmates thereof in accordance with section 6 of the act of January 7, 1925.

On No. 22: Appropriates \$36,782.02, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,817.84, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims under the Post Office Department.

On No. 24: Appropriates \$6,467.37, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,838.80, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims under the Treasury Department.

On No. 25: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation upon expenditures of the Farm Loan Bureau for personal services in the District of Columbia during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

On Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, relating to public buildings: Eliminates from the appropriation for the Marcus Hook quarantine station, as proposed by the Senate, the authority for repairing a gangway and for a boat landing; makes the appropriation for the San Francisco Mint Building available for using the vault doors now in the Subtreasury Building, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the appropriations of \$200,000 and \$50,000, respectively, inserted by the Senate, for the public buildings at Juneau, Alaska, and Durango, Colo., such buildings being provided for in the regular Treasury appropriation bill.

On No. 31: Appropriates \$336,72, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$322,13, as proposed by the House, for payment of damage claims under the War Department.

On No. 35: Appropriates \$370,000, as proposed by the Senate, for improvement of the water supply at Fort Douglas, Utah, modified so as to eliminate from the amendment the provision for the sale of surplus water.

On No. 38: Appropriates \$5,500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$11,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal property.

On No. 39: Strikes out the limitation, inserted by the Senate, to prohibit the payment of a judgment of the Court of Claims certified to Congress for payment in accordance with existing law.

On No. 40: Makes retroactive to the fiscal year 1926, as proposed by the Senate, the provision permitting payment of expenses of employees of the field services upon transfer from one official station to another.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments as follows:

On No. 19: Appropriating \$15,000 for relief of distress among needy Indians of the Turtle Mountain Band of North Dakota.

On No. 23: Providing for the deposit in the Treasury of the United States of certain money received from the Republic of Mexico.

On Nos. 32, 36, and 37: Appropriating \$3,110,000 for removal of certain ammunition from the ordnance depots at Curtis Bay, Md., and Raritan, N. J.

On No. 33: Relating to the use of \$30,000 of the appropriation for military posts for the employment of the services of architects and technical and professional services.

On No. 34: Relating to the appropriation of \$126,000 for the construction of officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WILL R. WOOD,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a couple of questions. I should like to ask the gentleman if he will make a very brief statement stating clearly what is meant in relation to the brick plant that is provided for at the Chillicothe Reformatory, and if there is any change in the established law as to other penal institutions in employing prisoners?

Mr. MADDEN. The conferees wrote a proviso into the appropriations act, which is section 6 of the substantive law authorizing the creation of the Chillicothe penal institution, and I would like to read that; it is short:

That the inmates of the United States Industrial Reformatory shall be employed only in the production and manufacture of supplies for the United States Government for consumption in the United States institution and in duties necessary for the construction and maintenance of the institution.

And the conferees understand that to mean that no inmate shall be employed in any other capacity than that described in this proviso, and that the bricks to be made under the appropriation shall be used as far as we know only for the construction of buildings connected with the institution itself.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman is entirely satisfied that by no interpretation of the general law in reference to prison labor with this proviso could they manufacture brick in this institution and sell to a school district to build a schoolhouse in Ohio?

Mr. MADDEN. I am quite sure they could not. They can not deal with anything except the United States institutions.

Mr. BEGG. I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the conference report. Before doing that I desire to make a short statement. The amount of the bill as it passed the Senate and which is now pending before us is \$210,411,668.02. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was \$200,359,997.40. The net sum added by the Senate is \$10,051,670.62. The House recessions embodied in the report, which has been read, amount to \$450,670.62, and the Senate recessions amount to \$6,350,000. The items in disagreement are Turtle Mountain Indians, relief of distress, \$15,000. Officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans., where they had a serious fire, \$126,000. Removal of ammunition at Curtis Bay, Md., and Raritan, N. J., \$3,110,000. Total disagreement, \$3,251,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a vote on the conference report, and then we will take up the matters in disagreement.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Relief of distress among certain Indians: For relief of distress among the needy Indians of Turtle Mountain Band of North Dakota, fiscal years 1927 and 1928, \$15,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House further disagree to the amendment of the Senate. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Any moneys received from the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of securing information on which to base a treaty between the United States and Mexico relative to the use of the waters of the Rio Grande, Lower Colorado, and Tia Juana Rivers as authorized by the act of March 3, 1927, shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur. I would like to explain it for a moment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is that the amendment I was interested in?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

As the matter came to the House in the first instance, it was proposed that a certain amount of money to be paid by the Republic of Mexico should be paid into the hands of the joint commission having jurisdiction over the boundary waters. But the Committee on Appropriations demurred to that, because it would not be wise to put money into any less unit or authority than the Treasury of the United States and then have it reapportioned to meet the needs of the activity. That is just what this does. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: For transportation of the Army any its supplies, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, \$2,200,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a suggestion for a compromise on this subject.

The SPEAKER. What is the motion of the gentleman?

Mr. MADDEN. My motion is to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I have a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is in order now. My motion has not yet been reported.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the motion to recede and concur would take preference over the motion of the gentleman from Illinois. However, the gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, the amendment has not yet been reported to the House by the Clerk.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion of the gentleman from Illinois will be reported first.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, or will make the point of order when the time comes, that it is not germane to the subject.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 32: Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 32, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by such Senate amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, through a joint board composed of persons appointed by them, shall make a survey of the points of storage of supplies of ammunition and components thereof for use of the Army and Navy, with special reference to the location of such ammunition and components as are in such proximity to populous communities and industrial areas as to constitute a menace to life and property. The result of such survey shall be embodied in a joint report which the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall make to Congress, not later than March 15, 1928, with their recommendations as to what changes, if any, should be made in such storage facilities and their points of location and the feasibility of the joint use thereof by the Army and Navy. Such expenses of the survey as may not otherwise be chargeable to current appropriations may be defrayed in equal parts from current appropriations for 'Ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department,' and 'Current expenses, Ordnance Service, War Department.'"

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The motion has been read only for information.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to explain the whole situation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Maryland can not take the floor without my yielding it anyway.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask if the gentleman from Illinois retains the floor when my motion is a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois retains the floor, but the gentleman from New Jersey will have an opportunity to make his motion.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most extraordinary proposals I have seen for a long time. The proposal here, including Senate amendments 32, 36, and 37, is to appropriate \$3,100,000 to transfer the ammunition now stored at Curtis Bay, Md., and at Raritan, N. J. They propose to send this ammunition across the country to other places and to expend this money for that purpose.

There are 50,000 tons of ammunition to be removed, the value of which is \$60,000,000. The people of Baltimore, in the vicinity of Curtis Bay, object to having the ammunition stored there. The people at Raritan, N. J., object to having it stored there. The Committee on Appropriations went thoroughly into this case. It is proposed to send some of this ammunition to Charleston, S. C.; part of it to Ogden, Utah; part of it to Pig Point, Va.; and part of it to Savanna, Ill. We gave a very careful hearing to the War Department on this question. General Williams, the head of the Ordnance Department, testified before the committee quite elaborately twice, and said that there is very remote danger of explosion where the ammunition is stored, but if there is serious danger where it is stored steps will be taken to remedy the situation and eliminate that danger. Then we gave a hearing to the delegations in the House from both Maryland and New Jersey.

Some of these gentlemen testified that there would be danger to life and property for a distance of 20 miles from the point of storage. And yet they propose to force the removal of these explosives to Savanna, Ill., and other places where it will not be much more than 5 miles away from large cities.

What the Committee on Appropriations wants to do is to protect both life and property and to be sure that when we do remove the ammunition from where it is stored, if we should do it, we shall remove it to some place where it will not have to be removed again the next day. That is a fair proposition, and that is what we propose, and to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] wants to make a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The only objection I have to the gentleman's proposition is this, that he is proposing to have the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy create a new board and

not a board made up of officials within the Army and the Navy.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; of the Army.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's amendment does not read that way.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what it means.

Mr. BLANTON. But that is not what it says. It says "persons," not "officers." If the gentleman will so word it that the personnel of this board must be selected from officials of the Army and the Navy, I will not make the point of order against it. If we leave it as the gentleman has written it, we all know that civilians will be put on this board, and we will then have to provide salaries for them; and we will never be able to get rid of the board. I will have no objection to it if you will require this board to be made up of officers, but I am against creating new outside boards, and I hope the gentleman is, too.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what we intend.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will read this language, he will see that the board is simply to be made up of "persons," which means civilians.

Mr. MADDEN. It probably does not say so, but that is what it means. I have no objection to amending it in that way.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman offer an amendment requiring the personnel of the board to be officers from the Army and the Navy?

Mr. MADDEN. We could change the word "persons" to "officers."

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will offer that amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. All we want to do is to insure the safety of life and property. If we can not get an amendment of this proposal we are going to move to insist on our objection to the Senate amendment, which will be to strike out the appropriation altogether. We do not want to do that, and we come here with this proposal as the result of a well-thought-out plan in which the conferees of the Senate and the House are in unanimous accord. I submit we have given evidence of a desire to dispose of this question and surround it with every safeguard. We have manifested no selfish disposition in the settlement of the problem. I am authorized to say to the House that this proposal represents the unanimous opinion of the Senate conferees and the House conferees, and we ask you, if you will, to adopt it in place of one of the items in dispute. If that is done, we will then move to strike out the appropriations for the other items, and we will be in a position, not later than the 15th of March, to come back to the House and to the Senate and know what we are doing.

Why should Maryland insist on imposing upon Illinois, on Virginia, and on South Carolina, and why should New Jersey propose to insist upon imposing on these States, a thing which they do not want themselves, and why should they not join us in an effort to solve the problem so that it will be satisfactory to everybody in the United States and safe at the same time?

Mr. BLANTON. I suggest that the gentleman now move that the word "persons" be stricken out and the word "officers" inserted.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I think my motion takes precedence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will change the word "persons" to "officers."

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I notice that in the bill we passed there is an appropriation to rehabilitate the Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey to the amount of \$2,300,000. Why should we rehabilitate and start up those arsenals anew if the people are opposed to them, do not want us there, and will not allow us to store our products after they are made? That is the same general proposition, so why not move them all and get them away from New Jersey?

Mr. LEHLBACH. If the gentleman will permit, the Picatinny Arsenal is not in the same class with the Raritan Arsenal. There is no objection to Picatinny Arsenal. It is located in an isolated spot, and the only town surrounding it is made up in large part of the population that is employed in the arsenal. They have no objection to anything stored at the Picatinny Arsenal.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield me five minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, this is merely postponing the consideration of this subject until the 15th of March. The War Department can deal with it just as effectively at this time if we make the appropriation as it can if you form a commission and have that commission report in March. The whole intent and purpose of the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois is that you appoint a commission of the Army and of the Navy to consider this matter and report. If you are going to leave it to the Army and the Navy, why can you not trust it to the Army now and let them remove the menace and not wait until the 15th of March and then follow along with legislation, so that no one can tell when an appropriation will be made? If you would only appropriate the money now and give it to the Army, or give it to the Army and the Navy, so far as that is concerned, and then go ahead with the work that would be all right. This is merely to form a commission to report in March, and the same people who would determine it now are the ones who will report it to Congress in March. Why, then, wait for a commission report?

I have tried to impress upon this House and I have tried to impress upon the people generally how important it is to the city of Baltimore, a city of 850,000, at whose very gates this menace lies, consisting of 25,000,000 pounds of high explosive, and yet we can not get enough money to remove even the high explosives from this depot.

I do not know how you gentlemen feel about it, but they have mentioned General Williams and have stated what he said before the committee. What could General Williams say? I ask each man in this House, What could General Williams say? Suppose he had said, "Mr. MADDEN, this ammunition is very dangerous; it may go off at any time; it may explode at any time." How many people do you suppose would be living around Curtis Bay to-day? He could not tell just how dangerous this situation is. If word should go out to the people of Baltimore city generally that the War Department had stated how dangerous this is, you would not be able to keep the people within 5 miles of the place. General Williams did the best he could under all the circumstances.

I do not think we are asking too much, because we only ask you to leave it to the Army, giving them an appropriation and letting them remove it to some safe place. I am sure the War Department will not endanger any locality.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that the people of Baltimore have even more confidence in the gentleman from Maryland than they have in General Williams, and yet the gentleman from Maryland has said that this is dangerous, but we have not noticed any hehira of people from Baltimore.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We brought here a number of people who have stated how dangerous it is, and we had an explosion there in September which demonstrated how dangerous it is, and yet it seems impossible for us to have you meet the situation.

History tells us Nero fiddled while Rome burned, and I think Congress is going to fiddle on this matter, perhaps, until we have some great disaster there, and then we will all wake up to the situation. It is true old Nero never expected the modern and beautiful part of Rome to burn. He perhaps only expected to burn that part which was not much good and very unsightly, but the wind changed, and, just so, an electric spark may strike this magazine at any time and destroy the magazine and likewise destroy a vast amount of property and a great number of people.

I plead with you to help us by your vote and not delay by a commission and its report.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, the committee on conference was confronted with a difficult situation. We appreciate the attitude of the gentlemen from Maryland and the gentlemen from New Jersey upon this matter, although personally, in view of the statements made by General Williams, I do not think the danger is quite as serious as they seem to think. But I am frank to say if these explosives were situated anywhere near my section I would want to see them moved under the circumstances.

However, the situation that confronted your committee is this, and I want the gentlemen of the House to understand what they are doing if they vote to recede and concur on this amendment. It is not a question of the \$3,100,000 which is necessary to move these explosives, but it is a question of whether you are going to take these explosives from their present location and place them in the neighborhood of other congested centers of population or of other cities.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] asks why not adopt this amendment permitting the Secretary of War to dispose of them or to move them. The Secretary of War has stated to the committee that he proposes to move them only where he can move them under present legislation, down here within 4 or 5 miles of Norfolk, Va., to Charleston, S. C., and over to Savanna, Ill., and, of course, a great quantity to Ogden, Utah. When you send them to Norfolk, to Charleston, or to Savanna, of course, you are going to be met with the same sort of situation, and certainly, while we want to relieve the fears of the people of Baltimore and of New Jersey, we do not want to do other sections and other congested centers an injustice.

So your committee did the only thing it could do. It proposes the amendment which the gentleman from Illinois has offered, which provides that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall make a survey and jointly report to Congress not later than March 15 some locality where these explosives can be stored without danger to citizens. It seems to me it is a perfectly reasonable proposition. They can not report to-morrow or next week, but we provide that this shall be done by March 15.

I think the gentleman from Maryland and the other gentlemen who are interested in this proposition ought to appreciate the fact that other sections of the country are involved and accept the proposition which the gentleman from Illinois has offered and which meets with the entire approval, as the gentleman has stated, of the Senate conferees as well as the House conferees.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has not Senator ODDIE, of Nevada, asked that this ammunition be sent to his State, where it will not be dangerous?

Mr. BYRNS. I understand they have asked that it be sent to Ogden. But the War Department and the Navy Department, or rather, in this instance, the War Department, naturally does not want to send all of its explosives beyond the Rocky Mountains. It is necessary to keep some of these reserves this side of the Rocky Mountains, and they do not propose to send them all there. They propose to store at the places I have mentioned the reserves they want on the east coast, and we think before any action is taken and before any money is expended this survey ought to be made, so that when they are moved they can be stored permanently or so long as the two departments may keep them.

Personally I approve very heartily the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], which proposes a joint survey, because I can see no reason why the Government should expend millions of dollars for the storage of explosives of the War Department in one place and then spend millions of dollars to purchase land to store the explosives of the Navy Department in another place.

This is a reasonable proposition and the only proposition that could be proposed under the circumstances, and I hope the gentleman will accept it and the House adopt it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, representing territory that has been repeatedly stricken through explosions that have been attended by a tremendous loss of life and property, I want to say that I am ready to go along with the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MADDEN] in the thought that it will provide some permanent relief for a condition under which the War Department continues the storage of high explosives in populated sections of the country.

At Camp Raritan to-day there are stored nearly one and one-half million high explosive shells and other munitions embodying in the gross aggregate over 1,000,000 pounds of T. N. T. It is my belief that there are more explosives stored to-day in Middlesex County—an industrial county—than anywhere in the United States. This is generally known; it keeps the people of my district in continual fear that they may suffer a repetition of the disastrous Morgan explosion of 1918, or of the ammonite disaster that took a toll of 20 lives—yes, and because of the quantities stored they know that the results of an explosion at Raritan may be far more appalling. We want these explosives removed. Yet I recognize, gentlemen, that the weakness in our request is that we are asking the removal of these explosives to existing Government arsenals where they may endanger the people of other municipalities.

With the exception of the Ogden depot, in Utah, the other arsenals suggested by General Williams in his testimony be-

fore the Appropriations Committee—Savanna Proving Ground, Ill.; Pig Point, Va.; and the Charleston depot, Charleston, S. C.—are so situated that the storage of explosives there would place other cities in an area of danger. It must be admitted, gentlemen, that there is danger—this has been agreed to by the President, by General Lord, Director of the Budget, and by the Secretary of War, who, in a letter to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, dated January 20, 1927, referred to the high explosives as "constituting a real menace."

We do not want other municipalities to be subjected to the same fears that are now entertained by the people of New Jersey and Maryland. For 10 years we have been advocating the removal of the explosives from Camp Raritan; to-day we have a constructive idea advanced that holds out hope of bringing this about. It will bring it about through the medium of a survey by Federal officials to determine where these explosives, now at Curtis Bay and at Raritan, may be moved without endangering the welfare and economic progress of other communities. When the location is determined, I feel sure that Mr. MADDEN and other members of the Appropriations Committee will aid in procuring funds for the removal of explosives to that point.

The report is to be made before March 15 next, and it is my hope that at this session we will secure legislation that will not only give relief to the localities affected, but will forever commit the Government to a policy under which the storage of explosives will no longer endanger lives and property of its citizens.

Appreciating this evidence of friendly cooperation on the part of the committee, I feel that all the Members of the New Jersey delegation will support the sane and constructive thought advanced in this amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is the purpose and expectation to move some of these high explosives to the Army magazine at Pig Point, Va. Pig Point lies on the outskirts of Portsmouth and Norfolk, with 250,000 people. We should object to the storage of any considerable amount of high explosives at Pig Point. We have St. Julians magazine, belonging to the Navy, that lies on the other side of the city of Portsmouth, at which point there has heretofore been stored a large amount of high explosives. Our people have been complaining of that, although we have made no demand that it be moved.

We do not want to increase the danger of that situation by bringing any large amount of explosives to Pig Point. We feel that it would be a menace to the lives and property of our people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland to recede and concur.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Illinois to ask for a division of the question. The motion to concur with an amendment would have priority over a motion to recede and concur. But that is not true until the question is divided. However, I will withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were 16 ayes and 118 noes.

So the motion was lost.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 86, line 1, after the figures "1927," insert: "without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, including also in connection with the erection of barracks at Fort Jay, Governors Island, not to exceed \$30,000 for the employment, by contract or otherwise, of the services of architects, or firms, or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as may be deemed necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, could not the gentleman consider those three amendments at one time, with the consent of the House?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not until we act upon each separately. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 86, after line 14, insert: "For construction and installation of officers' quarters at Fort Riley, Kans., including utilities and appurtenances thereto, as authorized by an act entitled 'An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1927, without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, \$126,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the Clerk reads I ask that amendments 36 and 37 be considered together, and also ask unanimous consent that the proposal for the appointment of a commission apply to all.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Could not the gentleman get unanimous consent that 32, 36, and 37 be considered together?

Mr. MADDEN. No; we could not do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that amendments numbered 36 and 37 be considered together, and without objection the Clerk will report both amendments.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendments 36 and 37: Pages 87 and 88, after line 22 on page 87, insert:

"Ordnance service: For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, \$340,000.

Repairs of arsenals: For repairs and improvements of arsenals and depots, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved February 23, 1927, for expenditure in connection with removing high-explosive ammunition from the Curtis Bay and Raritan ordnance reserve depots, fiscal years 1928 and 1929, \$570,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, that is all.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER. Under order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, through paid representatives, propagandists, and publicity agents, including its own consular agents and diplomatic representatives in our country, the Calles government of Mexico has been distributing in the United States books and pamphlets and other carefully prepared material for the American press, all designed to justify and defend before the American public a system of laws totally subversive of the fundamental principles of human liberties. In this way and through interviews published in the daily press and in periodicals of great influence in our country, President Calles has appealed to public opinion in the United States to support his attempts to subjugate the Mexican people and deprive them of their spiritual heritages and of their natural rights.

In his efforts to secure the sympathy and approval of the American people President Calles has sought to create the impression that the Mexican people themselves support his government and approve his interpretation of the laws of that country and his drastic decrees for their enforcement. By imposing a policy of rigid censorship over the Mexican press and over international news agencies he has kept from the American public all knowledge of the real attitude of the people of Mexico toward his government. Thus little has become known in our country of the protests of the Mexican people against the policies of the present government of that country and of the attitude of the Mexican press toward the Calles régime. The truth is that the Mexican people have valiantly and persistently resisted all of President Calles's attempts to destroy their liberties and have sought by every lawful means to secure a modification of the laws.

The crisis grows more intense in Mexico. The tyranny of Calles has been challenged by the people of Mexico. Issues have been more clearly defined, responsibilities more precisely

established. Catholic men and women in Mexico have refused longer to tolerate a system which denies to them the human rights and dignity which, in civilized nations, are deemed to be inalienable and of the very essence of justice.

Unmoved by the protests of his people, Calles is enraged. He defies that people; he defies public opinion throughout the world, and announces that the fight which he is waging upon religion is to be a fight to the finish.

Thus, at last, on the American Continent, we are witnesses of a new phase of that age-old struggle between liberty and tyranny; between those who hold that man, as man, is endowed with certain rights: Freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom of education, equalities before the law, the right to life and to the pursuit of happiness, and that these rights are inalienable and may not be denied by any human authority; and those who hold that man, as man, is nothing, that society is everything, that government, alone, has rights that are supreme; the doctrine of absolutism; the doctrine enforced by Carranza and the red flaggers, which they, refusing even to march under their own national banner, embodied in the constitution of Mexico in 1916, and imposed upon a prostrate people in 1917.

There are still some who hold that this contest between liberty and tyranny concerns only Mexico and the people of Mexico, that it does not concern the United States; that hands off Mexico is the only attitude and policy which the people of the United States and our Government may, in justice, assume toward Mexico.

The Mexican question is more than a rivalry between the Catholic bishops and priests of Mexico and the government of President Calles. It is more even than a contest between the Catholic Church and the Government of Mexico.

The constitution and laws of Mexico are a challenge to our institutions.

No man who has a love for the free institutions which we have inherited can look with complacency upon this movement. Through 50 consulates, maintained by the Government of Mexico, in continental United States, through a press that is owned or subsidized, and through other agencies, the advocates and defenders of this system are attacking our own institutions and seeking to engender national hatreds, the evil consequences of which no man can foresee. We are interested not alone in defending the person and the property of American citizens in Mexico; it is our patriotic duty to defend our institutions against the insidious attack to which they are subjected.

But we have a responsibility even more direct than this. The Government of the United States, by acts, direct and indirect, over a period of years, has thrown itself deliberately and unmistakably into the very heart of the Mexican problem. The Wilson administration violated the sovereignty of Mexico, actually waged war on Mexican territory, invading by force the ports of that country, in order to prevent a shipment of arms and supplies of war from reaching President Huerta. Huerta could not stand up against the opposition of the United States; his supporters abandoned him. He was driven from Mexico.

Our Government entered into relations with Villa, Zapata, Carranza, and no man knows just how many other insurgent chieftains in Mexico. The United States supported Carranza and, by arbitrarily imposing and lifting the embargo on arms, it gave force to its moral support and Carranza came into power and the constitution of 1917 was enacted.

Our State Department similarly gave its support to Obregon and again to Calles when there seemed a likelihood that they might not be able to resist successfully the opposition which their arbitrary acts and tyranny aroused. The people of the United States have a responsibility to the people of Mexico and to the world for the acts of a Government which, in truth, owes to us its very existence.

No doubt you will be interested to know what a famous international correspondent, Francis McCullagh, noted for his remarkable series of articles on Russia, has to say, in part, about the Mexican situation:

THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO¹

By Francis McCullagh

The American press prides itself on letting the limelight of publicity penetrate into every nook and cranny of public life; nevertheless it maintains a strange silence about Mexico, although that country is in a worse state of disintegration than ever it was. Mexico has, in fact, reached such a condition that sometimes an impartial foreign observer like myself can not help asking himself, "Are we witnessing the break-up of a nation?"

Of this condition I myself was an eyewitness during six weeks that I have just spent in Mexico, through which I traveled "on my own," in the same way as I traveled through Bolshevik Russia in 1920.

I found that the critical condition of the country was admitted by all the foreign diplomatists, and especially by the American diplomatists. I was shown incontrovertible proofs of general disintegration, chaos, murder, misgovernment, and unbelievable financial corruption—proofs which make me fear that the condition of Mexico is more hopeless than even that of Russia, where, at all events, the existence of the Russian race is not in danger. These proofs I shall try to present in a few words; but, incredible as the picture may seem to be, it is weak and neutral in comparison with the lurid canvas which exists in the American Embassy at Mexico City, in the State Department at Washington, in the British Foreign Office, in every foreign office in Europe, and in the private offices of the great newspaper owners here in New York.

For once in the amazing history of the American press you have the New York reporter telling a much more restrained and dignified "story" than that which is told by the elderly, sedate diplomatists—and by fact itself!

You have in Mexico City American "news gatherers" with a talent for irresponsible writing and a thirst for the sensational sending dull and monotonous narratives of events south of the Rio Grande, wiring descriptions of presidential election meetings which (judging from these descriptions) seem to have been so irreproachably correct and stagnant that, in comparison with them, the dullest county council meeting that ever sat in Shropshire would seem riotous and even revolutionary.

And, on the other hand, you have old, experienced, and scholarly diplomatists, men with an ingrained habit of understatement and a professional hatred of journalistic exaggeration, writing secret dispatches calculated to make one's flesh creep and one's hair stand on end.

To describe a few of the amazing things that are happening in Mexico: The Catholic churches are all closed, and the people who go to mass in private houses are frequently arrested by the police, but are released on paying fines which provide something for the Government and about a thousand pounds weekly of private "graft" for certain police officials.

Even the Government statistics show an alarming decrease in the population, already most dangerously small. President Calles is robbing foreigners and Mexican landowners of their land for the sake (he says) of the workman and the peon; but the workman and the peon are rushing out of the country like people escaping from a house on fire. According to Mexican statistics, Mexicans are leaving Mexico at the rate of 5,000 per day.

There are now 3,000,000 Mexicans permanently established in the southern part of the United States, and their places are being taken by Japanese and Chinese. Thirty-three Japanese families landed at Manzanillo while I was on the Mexican west coast. They are to colonize the hacienda of Estranzuela in Jalisco and other haciendas in adjoining States. Twenty-seven Japanese families were due to arrive a few days later.

In some places there are more Orientals than Mexicans; in Mexicali, for example, there are 7,000 Chinese to only 4,000 Mexicans. President Calles tried hard to get Jewish agricultural colonists and managed to get 50 Jewish families from Europe; but no sooner did they have a look around than they all disappeared in the direction of the United States.

As for the political situation there is every sign of a three-cornered civil war and a general smash up before the end of the present elections. A fight between Obregon, Serrano, and Gómez is certain to take place before the middle of next year.

Though the "election" will not be held till July, 1928, everybody is getting ready for trouble, which may come sooner and quite suddenly.

With characteristic foresight the British community in Mexico City has just decided to enlarge its cemetery, and with that object in view has started a vigorous "drive" for subscriptions; while, in view of the federal capital being isolated before the end of the year, the American Club is busy importing alcoholic refreshments.

The head of one diplomatic mission expressed to me his regret that "we shall be cut off from the sea when Gómez takes Vera Cruz. No more mail, no more supplies from home. Very awkward! I am doubtful if the wine we ordered will get here before the trouble begins.

The law of the ejidos, enabling any set of ruffians to carve a choice bit out of an expensively irrigated and developed ranch, and the agrarian law permitting the confiscation of part of the ranch, have ruined agriculture.

Every Mexican recognizes the imminence of a dreadful crisis. Callista and conservative alike, when they have been able to do so, have sent their families and their funds to the safety of the United States. The hotels of Los Angeles and San Antonio are filled with Mexican guests, and the American banks are bursting with Mexican money. Many of Calles's own relations, much of his fortune, are north of the border.

Mines are closing down all over Chihuahua and Durango. Oil production is falling off. In June, 1926, it was 9,400,000 barrels; in June, 1927, it was 5,500,000 barrels, though the production should have been doubled instead of halved. Owing to the operation of the ley de estranjeria, the breath of life which American enterprise breathed into

¹ From the National Review (London Tory monthly), October.

the Mexican west coast is leaving it again, and the land reclaimed from the great Sonora Desert is going back again to its primitive wildness.

I do not maintain, of course, that there has been absolute silence in the press, for on several occasions a corner of the curtain was lifted. But on such occasions there was always some unseen but agitated interference from behind that curtain—and the corner was hastily dropped again. There was a tussle behind the scenes and vigorous whispering—then silence as before.

America is an amazing country, but it never before presented such an amazing problem as this. For the last hundred years it has been scolding Europe about freedom of the press—and, lo, its own press is shackled. For the last 50 years it has been denouncing secret diplomacy—and now we find the secret files in the Mexican section of the State Department at Washington guarded with a care worthy of the Tsardom. For the last nine years it has been lecturing Europe on the mess it was making of its foreign diplomacy and explaining how it, the United States, would manage if it were in the Balkans or on the Polish corridor, or master of Trieste. But meanwhile the appalling situation on its own southern border has been rapidly getting worse—and, instead of tackling that situation, the United States hastily buries its head in the sand like an ostrich.

Its newspapers, now the richest in the world, sent scores of the best American journalists to China, although the State Department has formulated no definite policy on the Chinese question, except the policy of doing nothing. It will leave England to protect American interests in China, but it will see that a good-sized crowd of American reporters are there to criticize her while she is doing it.

But in Mexico City, where there is not a single British journalist, the United States has only one regular correspondent, and, unfortunately, he writes for the *World*, a paper which constantly takes the part of Calles against Coolidge and of the Mexicans against Yankees—a paper whose attitude on the Mexican question reminds me of the attitude of the *London Daily News* on the Transvaal question about a quarter of a century ago. Consequently this correspondent has a double reason for caution—the Mexican censor and his own editor. He has already been expelled once, and is determined not to send news that will lead to his expulsion again.

A week ago there was another American correspondent in Mexico City, a Mr. Joseph de Courcy, but, though he was extremely cautious, he was summarily kicked out on August 12, after having been arrested and lodged in a cell whose walls were pitted with bullet holes (having been evidently used as a place of execution). When a member of the American Embassy tried to see him the police denied that he had been arrested, but the embassy, the State Department, and the *New York Times* bore the insult with touching humility. The whole story will be found in the *New York Times* of August 13. It is that of a man who has been beaten and kicked by a bully and has no redress.

One asks one's self in amazement if this is the America which used to be so fond of tail twisting.

The British Foreign Office adopts a different policy. When the Soviet Government imprisoned Mrs. Stan Harding, who was the correspondent, not of any English newspaper, but of the *New York World*, Lord Curzon made the Soviet Government apologize to her and pay her \$15,000 compensation. The result was that English correspondents in Russia felt that they would not be punished for telling the truth—and they told the truth.

Apart from the one regular, but muzzled, correspondent, there are, of course, the usual news agencies, which, as in other countries, accept official news and circulate it without examination.

If a Massachusetts missionary is captured by brigands on the Acroceraunian Mountains, or if the Estonian Navy fires a salute of only 19 instead of 21 guns in honor of the American representative at Reval, or if there is one star missing in the American flag displayed at the Quai d'Orsay on the occasion of Colonel Lindbergh's official reception at Paris—well, the U. S. A. will want to know why such things are possible in the twentieth century, and from New York to San Francisco the famous Sunday supplements will be full of Albania and Estonia and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs; but if Mexico confiscates half a million acres reclaimed from the wilderness by mere American farmers, or the Governor of Puebla has French families slaughtered in order that he may seize their land, then the State Department strikes a sphinxlike attitude and America's one panic-stricken correspondent in Mexico City is sternly warned to say nothing (as if he would dare to open his lips, poor fellow!).

Some months ago Mr. Ybarra, an able American journalist, was sent to Mexico by one of the leading American newspapers, and began a series of articles on the situation. Having a complete command of Spanish, he was able to get a perfectly true picture, and, being an honest journalist, he started to paint that picture in a series of articles such as that which I am now writing, only far stronger and better. The situation was so critical, the condition of affairs so frightful, that he sent the whole of the first article by radio from the steamer whereon he left Vera Cruz for the United States. That article

appeared exactly as it had been written. A corner of the curtain had thus been lifted. But then took place the amazing performance which I have already described, and which has taken place more than once under similar circumstances. There was a mysterious scuffle behind the scenes; the corner of the curtain went down suddenly. There was an interval of silence, after which the rest of the articles began to appear. But how different from the first article! They were like Ella Wheeler Wilcox after Homer, like *In the Gloaming* after Chalkovskil's 1812. They had been rewritten and so severely edited that they might all have been taken from some placid old guidebook.

Part of the responsibility is due to high finance; part of it is due to sundry great American capitalists who have land in Mexico; and, strange to say, part of it is due to the State Department at Washington.

There are Wall Street financiers who are getting interest from Mexico and can offer opposition to any exposure of the Mexican situation. There are American landowners who have Mexican ranches that are not touched by the agrarian law—as the estates of Calles himself, of his sons and his generals, and of Obregon, are not touched by it. Finally, the State Department, which tried, with extraordinary inaptitude, to raise an anti-Mexican storm here last winter, has now gone to the opposite extreme. Not only has it prevented attacks on Calles from appearing in the American press; it has actually prevented them from appearing in the European press! This latter fact I discovered while negotiating the sale of a series of articles on Mexico to the representatives in America of great foreign newspapers. These men told me bluntly that what I said was true, but that they could not afford to offend the State Department. The curious part of the story is that American consuls and diplomatists now in Mexico, or who recently were in Mexico, take exactly the same view of the Mexican problem as I take in this article—only that their detestation of the Calles régime is infinitely stronger than mine.

But religion, of course, plays an important part in producing the journalistic reticence to which I have alluded. In the United States the religious issue—that is, the good old Protestant versus Catholic issue—is as strong to-day as it is in Belfast. It is a thousand times stronger than it is in England, from which, if we except Liverpool, it has almost died out.

America is a Protestant country, in the same sense as England is, and her Protestantism has always tinged very strongly her relations with Mexico. For the last century she has hailed with joy the appearance in Mexico of any "liberal" and anticlerical leader, just as England, from whom she inherited her prejudices against "Dagos" and Catholics, hailed with joy the appearance of Garibaldi. Save in the time of Porfirio Diaz, she invariably helped such anticlericals, because she honestly believed that if Mexico only became Protestant all the ills from which she suffered would at once be cured. Moreover, if she became Protestant, there would no longer be any danger of her setting up a monarchical system of government, dangerous to her great northern neighbor.

Consequently, the United States allowed Mexican "liberals" and anticlericals to launch revolution from Texas and Arizona, but she sternly prevented Mexican conservatives from doing so. She raised the arms embargo in favor of Juárez, Madero, and Carranza, but she slammed it firmly on Victoriano Huerta, on Adolfo de la Huerta, on Felix Diaz, and on the Mexican conservatives who are at present engaged in gun running along America's southern border.

But what of the radical newspapers in America? Strange to say, it was from one of them, the *New Republic*, August 17, 1927, that the worst attack on President Calles came; but the American radical press is not prepared for such a strange state of things. Calles professes to be a radical, and, if the capitalistic papers refrain from attacking him, there is all the more reason why the radical papers should refrain.

"But," I hear the reader ask with a malicious chuckle, "what about oil?"

Some of the American oil barons in Mexico are undoubtedly rich, corrupt, powerful, and extremely unscrupulous, but those very qualities make the American public distrust them, as a section of the British public, 28 years ago, distrusted the gold barons of the Rand. The oil scandal and the tales that filter north about the crime and corruption in American circles in Tampico * * * have helped to bar Mexican news from most American newspapers. It does not, however, excuse the editors who have repeatedly sent trusted members of their staff to Mexico but afterwards refused to publish their articles because they condemned the Calles régime. Surely the best course for the American press to take would be to send its "star" men, not to China, but to Mexico, to make a determined investigation of the whole Mexican question, and not to ignore it.

Last but not least, the American newspaper reader is "tired" of Mexico.

There are still other causes, which I have not time to analyze; but here I might say that this hush-hush policy is not only un-American,

pettifoggery, and unworthy of a great Nation, but it is also dangerous. Indeed, it is extremely dangerous, because of the bolshevist and anti-American turn which events have taken in Mexico during the last six months. I have been traveling for the last two years in Central and South America, and my conclusion is that in Central America, at all events, the Russo-Mexican poison is working so well that all these little Republics may go Red within a few years. And it will not be the ordinary Latin-American revolution this time; it will be an economic bolshevist revolution, entailing partial expropriation of foreign property—as in Mexico. Nicaragua was a foretaste. The United States was able to deal with Nicaragua, but she will not be able to put out the flames if they involve a dozen republics at once and are encouraged by the very large, powerful, and wealthy army of pacifist cranks who are rapidly becoming as strong in the United States as the prohibitionists.

In the very hotel where I am writing this article one of the guests is the notorious Luis N. Morones, the Mexican Minister of Industry and Labor, and the head of the great bolshevist organization known as the Crom.

New York City may look back on this visit of Morones with the same feelings that London looks back on the visit Lenin paid it in 1903, when he first organized his party.

And while Morones is enjoying the luxury of the Waldorf-Astoria and receiving innumerable, swarthy visitors, a different scene is being enacted not five miles off, on the Hudson River, where a gun-running steamer is being rapidly equipped by a number of revolutionaries from Colombia. And this is not the only gun-runner which South American revolutionaries are fitting out at present in the United States. A Venezuelan gun-runner was seized some time ago by the United States police. Others are under observation. Some, perhaps, have escaped suspicion.

Most New Yorkers laugh at these preparations. "We have always had them," they say joyously. "New York has always been a center for the South American revolutionist. We do not suffer by it. We are used to it."

You are not used, however, to the new or bolshevist brand of revolution, which is the only kind you are going to get now. You refrain even from sending a stiff note to Mexico lest it should lead to expense and annoyance and should affect the markets and should lose you, perhaps, several hundred thousand dollars. But this a "penny wise, pound foolish" policy, bad even in a small New England store, but fatal in the Government of a great Nation. The result of your inaction may be a conflagration involving the loss of the \$3,000,000,000 worth of investments which you have in Latin America, and perhaps of another \$3,000,000,000 spent by you on the naval and military measures necessitated by this situation.

The situation in Mexico is very different in many ways, of course, from the situation in China, but these two countries have one thing in common—huge foreign investments. Taught by Moscow, the Chinese have discovered that the confiscation of these investments is not only possible but can be justified by texts from Karl Marx and converted into an act of heroic patriotism by the waving of the nationalistic flag, and will be applauded by various humanitarian and religious associations in the country whose nationals are thus plundered.

There are three billions of American dollars in Latin America (I seem to hear Comrade Morones murmur the words "Oh, joy!" from the apartment underneath me).

There are, I repeat, three billions of American dollars in Latin America, and poor old effete, much-lectured Europe is not likely to help Uncle Sam to keep hold of them. Moreover, Europe has been sternly warned off by the United States, which undertook, in effect, to protect European interests in South America, since she will not let Europe do so herself. But the United States is powerless to keep that implied undertaking even in Mexico, where, during the last 10 years, there have been innumerable outrages on Europeans and much confiscation of European property. Europe has said nothing officially, because she owed America money, was otherwise occupied, and saw that the Yankee in Mexico was more neglected by Washington than the European. But Europeans whispered among themselves some extremely pungent—though unofficial—comments. One European diplomatist in Mexico City spoke to me most irreverently of "Uncle Sam Micawber" waiting for something to turn up in Mexico and save him from the trouble of taking a decision. Another drew a humorous picture of a water-logged State Department manned by cowboys and country lawyers, sailing around in circles, without map or compass or any clear idea of their destination. A third pointed out the remarkable resemblance between the State Department under Kellogg and the Most Holy Synod under Pobysdonostsev.

But the matter has now got beyond the jocose stage, and the European diplomatists accredited to the court of Chapultepec are becoming genuinely alarmed at the prospect of Mexico's example being followed by all Central America.

The powder train is being lighted in Mexico, while Uncle Sam looks on with determination in another direction.

For America the year 1927 is the calm before the storm.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I wonder if, before the gentleman concludes his own part of these remarks, he is going to tell us what he thinks we ought to do with regard to Mexico.

Mr. CONNERY. I would say now that with the conditions as they are in Mexico I am not one of those who desire to interfere with the President of the United States or with the State Department in suggesting to them exactly what they shall do in respect to Mexico. I do not wish to interfere and I do not think any good American wishes to interfere. We want friendly relations with Mexico, but we want the truth from Mexico, coming from the Mexican people and not the propaganda of their despotic government. We do not want this paid propaganda spread throughout the United States, falsely telling the American people that the people of Mexico are in accord with their Government, that they are behind the Calles government, and are satisfied with that Government, when the people down there in Mexico are struggling and suffering under tyranny and oppression, persecution and murders.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I say to the gentleman that I think his statement is very proper and a very temperate one.

Mr. CONNERY. Furthermore, let me say a word to the gentleman with respect to Colonel Lindbergh, that distinguished and wonderful young man [applause], who was so charmingly introduced to this House by the Speaker a few days ago. I hope that Colonel Lindbergh's visit to Mexico will do much to help relations with the people of Mexico as distinguished from the Government of Mexico. Colonel Lindbergh, a hero, modest, every inch a man, well might say to the Mexican people, if the State Department would allow him to, "The American people from the bottom of their hearts are with you in your fight for liberty and freedom of conscience." I understand also that Will Rogers is down there in Mexico or has been there. To divert for a moment, you gentlemen will recall that only the day before yesterday we defeated an amendment here calling for the repeal of the admission tax. We have down there in Mexico, or we did have until lately, an unofficial ambassador, Will Rogers, of the United States, who came from the American stage, and who represented the spoken drama, which we are penalizing by keeping on the admission tax. Mr. Rogers, together with Colonel Lindbergh, are on a sort of unofficial visit to cement friendly relations between the United States and Mexico. I can not believe that the State Department by this move contemplates telling the world that it approves of Mexico's present Government. If they do mean that, then they are deliberately fooling the American people and using two honest Americans as cat's-paws in their game.

All thinking Americans have the friendliest of sentiments for the Mexican people, but must condemn unreservedly the Mexican Government, which subjects the people of that unfortunate country to tyranny and has taken away from them the last vestige of freedom and liberty.

You know they say laughter is good for the soul. Medical men tell us laughter lengthens life; that it is good for the body, good for the muscles, and is a tonic. If this be so, let us hope that Mr. Rogers's good humor and laughter may develop a soul in Calles that will bring forth other attributes than cruelty, rapacity, and persecution of the Mexican people. These seem to be the most apparent attributes of his soul at the present time.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I will yield.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Does not the gentleman think there is an indication on the part of the Government of Mexico to change its policy, and the fact that they have received these Americans is it not part of that indication? May we not hope that there will be a gradual change and finally a complete one?

Mr. CONNERY. That is what I am hopeful for. I hope the visit of Colonel Lindbergh to the Republic of Mexico will bring about an understanding such as we have never had before. Gentlemen of the House will remember the President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, sent a note to the German people over the heads of the German Government asking the German people to believe the United States was fighting for democracy. I hope the Mexican people will realize that the people of the United States are in sympathy with them and not their Government.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Certainly.

Mr. BOX. The gentleman indicates that the American press had suppressed the truth.

Mr. CONNERY. I do.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman indicate to the House who he thinks is responsible. Is it the Mexican Government or the American Government who did it?

Mr. CONNERY. Later on we will see about the American Government. Right now I will say the Mexican Government, the American press, some big oil interests, and other big moneyed corporations who have interests in Mexico are responsible for suppressing the real news.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Is it really Mexican money you speak of, corporations doing business in Mexico, money being employed in Mexico?

Mr. CONNERY. I do not quite get the gentleman's question. Does he refer to Mexican money spent in the United States?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I believe it is Mexican money; yes.

There, gentlemen of the House, you have the opinion of an unbiased critic.

Those who defend President Calles and the program which he is imposing on the Mexican nation ask the people of the United States to accept as valid the claim that, after all, the oppression which is being practiced upon the people of Mexico is nothing more than the natural consequence of an honest effort to enforce the law in a country where people are lawless by tradition.

We have a right to expect that men who claim to be directing a program of law enforcement will themselves respect the law, and, above all, that they will administer justice with scrupulous honesty and impartiality. That this is not being done in Mexico is evident to anyone familiar with recent events. Under the flimsiest pretexts, peaceful and defenseless men and women are being arrested, tortured, thrown into jail, deported, and even put to death. This is done in open violation of the constitution and the laws of the country.

Fragmentary reports of atrocities committed under authority and even by direction of the Government have come to the American people, but a rigid censorship makes it impossible for our news-gathering agencies to keep us adequately informed of what is really happening in Mexico. A partial and sometimes a false presentation of the facts has misled public opinion in our country.

The following statements presented by me are taken wholly from the editorial columns of Mexican newspapers of wide circulation in that country. They are the deliberate statements made by responsible men having full knowledge of the facts. These spokesmen for the Mexican nation have a right to be heard in our country. The force of public opinion in America acting on the Government and people of Mexico will aid in solving the problems which confront that unfortunate nation.

The verdict of the Mexican press itself is that those who control Mexico's destinies are holding the nation captive; are drying up its sources of virtue and morality; are erasing its traditions and leading the nation straight on the road to tyranny; that democracy lies rotting in Mexico.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN MEXICO—THE VERDICT OF THE MEXICAN PRESS

THE MEXICAN PROBLEM STATED

There are in Mexico those who hold that everything in our national life which in any way has been derived from Christianity or from Spain must at once be discarded. They are willing to brook no delay. Their fanaticism is such that it does not stop even at violence and bloodshed.

In their madness, these "liberals" are not to be satisfied until they have torn from the soul of our nation all of her traditions; until they have brutally cut the people adrift from its past to launch it, without rudder or compass, into the uncertainties of a reform which can hold nothing but shipwreck. * * * They have convinced themselves that in this way alone can happiness be brought to the nation or the national welfare assured. Obstinate in this conviction, they devote themselves with a zealous fury to a work which can end only by drying up the very sources of virtue and morality; turning back the currents of civilization and of culture to set up in their place a secularism, primitive and obsolete. * * *

To suppress the past of the people is to suppress the people itself, to erase the traditions of the nation is to destroy the life of the nation, to turn our backs on our spiritual heritage is to march straight on the road to tyranny. (El Pais, February 22, 1926.)

November 20 we will celebrate the sixteenth anniversary of the first shot fired in the revolution. Sixteen years ago the revolution received its first holocaust of blood. How frightful has been the conflict! How agonizing the convulsions! How bloody the sacrifices! Following that tragic day at Puebla, what dreams have remained unrealized! What projects defeated! (La Prensa, November 12, 1926.)

Our public men look to material force for everything. They never have recourse to the arts of persuasion. The revolution sought neither to convince nor to persuade. It knew nothing but physical force. It sought only to impose its will at the point of the bayonet. The governments set up by it have never sought to govern with the approval of the nation. They have sought only an approval that is partisan, excluding everything not of the revolution. Can we in this way ever bring peace to men's consciences, ever restore that union of souls which to a true republic is as the blood of life and alone can sustain its vigor? * * *

Few pages indeed in the history of Mexico exhale such rottenness as do those written since 1913. We search them in vain for anything bright. Crimes, ambitions, assaults make up the tragedy which is our national life.

What moral conquest has been won since the fall of Porfirio Diaz? Do you say respect for the suffrage? Recognition of the rights of State governments? Honesty in public administration? The independence of the courts from pressure by the executive? Greater culture in the legislature? Greater respect for public opinion? Greater personal security guaranteed to the people? Look where we will, we search in vain for any evidence of real progress. * * *

The spiritual breakdown of the revolution is apparent. The revolution has failed to bring happiness to Mexico because it has chosen brute force for its idol, because it has held the people of Mexico in such low esteem as to disdain to seek its approval. * * * Such a revolution is not progress. It is retrogression, degradation. (El Universal, December 14, 1926.)

In our country there is but one political party—the victorious. Its sole preoccupation is to surround itself with men who will support it, enabling it to go on gleaming the profits to be derived from its control of the nation. (El Universal, November 19, 1926.)

The most discouraging fact in our public life is the fact that nothing is done to check our descent to standards that are ever lower and lower. Beginning with the revolution of 1910, that lowering of standards has been in progress until to-day its results are apparent to all. * * * Day by day the exercise of the suffrage is being abandoned. * * * (El Universal, September 29, 1926.)

We know only too well that the suffrage is a lie, a mockery; the vote of the people decides nothing in Mexico. * * * In the States, the officer who is in command of military operations has the last say in deciding the results of an election and, in this he is supported by orders received from headquarters. Our Federal Republic no longer, in reality, exists. (Excelsior, December 27, 1926.)

People do not vote in Mexico, because they are not encouraged to vote. Our election machinery is complicated. The ballot is not respected. * * * The suffrage has been converted into a public calamity by the brutality of the ruffians who actively engage in politics. Far from being schools from which civic action is to be learned, the polls harbor only rottenness and violence. Responsibility for this failure to realize the aspirations which grew up around the revolution of 1910 belongs to those professional politicians who, unable to understand the aspirations of a people, have failed to give to these that direction which the common good required. Had they devoted themselves to that task intelligently, they would never have trampled under foot the hopes that were born of the revolution, and Mexico to-day would be holding elections in which the will of the people would find an adequate expression. (El Universal, July 3, 1926.)

Power is in the hands of a minority who hold the nation captive to be exploited. * * * Corruption is on every hand. The dead body of democracy in which the men of 1910 thought they still could see the spark of life lies rotting to-day in Mexico where, like Lazarus, but, in vain, it hopes for the miracle that is to bring it to life again. (El Universal, September 29, 1926.)

ANTIRELIGIOUS DECREES

In the debate which preceded the delegation by Congress to the President of authority to revise the criminal code, the support of public opinion was won for the project because it was at the time declared that the purpose was to so amend our laws as to adjust them to the tendencies of modern jurisprudence and make them more adaptable to the practical conditions of present-day life. It was publicly announced that a committee of experts would have charge of the work of revision. Now, to our surprise, long before the work of codification is completed, without any plan that can be considered scientific, a law is promulgated changing the penal system with regard to acts of religious worship, creating new crimes in both the common and the federal order. * * *

We are astounded at this amendment of the criminal code. It breathes the spirit of harshness. In article after article it sets down new penalties, imprisonment, arrest, fines, one year, two years, even six years in jail, as punishment for acts which, by the moral standards publicly accepted amongst us, can not be held to be criminal. * * * If a stop is not put to this practice of stretching the scope of the constitution by the acts of the courts and of the police, we are bound in the end to set up a system as inhuman and inquisitorial as that which long ago was condemned in our own history. * * *

The great difficulties as well as the great hopes which fill our national life to-day are the difficulties and hopes of reconstruction. They are industrial, commercial, social, agricultural, educational. Anything which breeds dissension and controversy or leads to a disturbance of the public order or to the revival of the religious problem is not only profitless but can be accounted for only on the grounds of personal feeling and intolerance. (El Universal, July 5, 1926.)

LAWS REDUCING THE NUMBER OF PRIESTS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The attempt to enforce the State law reducing the number of priests in the State of Michoacan has resulted in an appeal to the courts for an order restraining the State authorities.

The constitution, as is well known, guarantees to all Mexicans, without distinction, the liberty to exercise the profession of his choice and that "the exercise of this liberty can not be denied excepting by judicial order when the rights of third parties are infringed, or by executive order issued under the conditions prescribed by law when the rights of society are violated."

In Fraction VI of article 130 of the constitution the ministry is declared to be a profession. The exercise of that profession can not be said to injure the rights of others or to violate the rights of society. The prohibition, therefore, which the state legislature has decreed is a flagrant violation of the law itself. It is, moreover, a violation of the liberties guaranteed by both the law and the constitution. * * *

The district court has denied the petition for a restraining order in the following terms: " * * * The court finds the decree to be within the authority of the State legislature." * * * But the provision of the constitution by which this authority is granted to the State legislature is not a mandate by which the legislature is obliged to restrict the number of priests. On the contrary, the constitution itself clearly states the limitations within which this authority should be exercised and provides that in all cases due consideration be given to local conditions and necessities. * * * From the capital of Michoacan down to the last village in the State this antireligious law is protested by the people, and this hateful regulation, far from corresponding to any public necessity, is a serious injury to the spiritual interests of the whole people. (El Pais, April 23, 1926.)

TYRANNY IN THE MEXICAN STATES

Yesterday we published the news that a group of women circulated for signature a petition which this morning they are to present to the State legislature. The petition circulated in the city of Chihuahua alone carries thousands of signatures, and it is apparent that sentiment is unanimous against the enactment of a law regulating article 130 of the constitution. * * * Later dispatches show that numberless telegrams are being received by Congressmen from all parts of the State. From Cusihuic and San Antonio alone 250 telegrams were received yesterday and five petitions with more than 3,000 signatures. The same is true of every section of the State.

One of the telegrams from Cusihuic reads as follows:

"We command the chamber to let the religious question alone. We withdraw our confidence from our own representative."

The Knights of Columbus, Chihuahua Council, filed a protest from which we quote the following:

"In the name of the 250 citizens members of this council of the Knights of Columbus, we request that, acting as becomes true representatives of the people, you turn not a deaf ear to the voice of the great majority of the people of Chihuahua who do not want any law regulating article 130 of the constitution."

* * * The deputies, if they insist on the enactment of this regulatory law contrary to the religion of their constituents, will justify the charge that is made that they have repudiated their character as representatives of the people. * * * (El Correo de Chihuahua, May 29, 1926.)

LOCAL AUTONOMY SUPPRESSED

The life, the public administration, the prosperity of every State of the Union, in spite of everything our so-called politicians say, depend upon whether or not the Secretary of Gobernacion gets up in the morning in good humor. * * * The all-important question is, How do the scribes and pharisees who surround the secretary feel toward the parties to any controversy? No one can be so stupid as not to see that the system he has adopted of recognizing and refusing to recognize governors who have been elected in the States can have no other consequences than the complete repudiation of our federal system. (Excelsior, February 9, 1927.)

PERSECUTION OF THE PRESS—LIBERTY OF THE PRESS IN MEXICO

Liberty is as necessary to the press as breath is to life. Without liberty there can be no press. * * * Liberty of thought and expression, guaranteed though it is by our laws, has in reality been suffocated by the censorship. Great daily papers capable of supporting themselves from their own resources, looking to the Government for neither orders nor subsidies, having no resources apart from the good will and material help of the public, are only now beginning to make their appearance in Mexico. * * *

Let us never lose sight of the fact that liberty has made possible the development of the press in Mexico and that without it the press can not subsist. We are performing only our duty when we repeat and insist that any censorship, no matter how it may be disguised, and which men dare not write into our laws because to do so would bring upon them the charge of being reactionary, of having repudiated the spirit of the revolution, is the poison which in the end will inevitably bring death to the young and vigorous organism, the new-born periodical press of Mexico. (El Universal, June 14, 1926.)

Article 13: "No religious periodical publications nor any other periodical publications of a marked religious tendency, manifested either in the name or in the policy of the publication, shall comment on questions of national politics nor report any acts of the public authorities of the country nor of any private person when these are in any way directly or indirectly related to the public administration." (Diario Oficial, July 2, 1926.)

Regardless of the opinion held by the Secretary of Gobernacion, this paper maintains and will continue to maintain that this article 13 is a violation of the constitution. * * * The provisions of the decree of July 2 are such that the agents of the Department of Justice may interpret them so as to include newspapers which can by no stretch of the imagination be fairly held to be "confessional" and this they can do with no other justification than the charge made by themselves that the periodical has published news or comment of a religious nature. Article 130 refers exclusively to "periodicals of a confessional character." (Excelsior, July 23, 1926.)

If the press of the Republic were subject to no restrictions but those justified by a strict interpretation of the constitution, the liberty of the press would be practically assured. * * * But article 13 of the law of July 2, 1926, because of its indefinite phraseology, will make it inevitable that the press subject itself to a restraint which is wholly unworthy of the epoch in which we live or the degree of culture to which we have attained. Hereafter, no writer will have the courage to face the dangers in which he is inevitably exposed by this grant of authority to agents of the Attorney General. * * * There is no gainsaying the fact that hereafter the press is to be a puppet in the hands of the Secretary of Gobernacion and his agents. (El Universal, July 21, 1926.)

Assaults on the liberty of the press are now taking place all over the Republic. What has happened at Chihuahua, Tampico, and Guanajuato leaves no doubt of the dangers which now threaten the press. The persecution to which El Correo Del Centro has been subjected is but a symptom. The arrest of the editors and even of the pressroom employees leaves no ground for hope. These humble men, imprisoned in the historic castle of Granaditas, speak with greater eloquence than could ever speak the inflamed paragraphs of any protest we might make. (El Universal, Aug. 31, 1926.)

Not even the constitution is complied with. Those who are loudest in their demand that the opposition obey the constitution are the first themselves to refuse to obey it. * * * We need only mention the closing of 70 printing establishments, under orders not yet made public, in violation of the expressed command of the constitution, which in article 7 says: "Under no circumstances shall a printing press be sequestered as the corpus delicti."

In these cases, there certainly has been sequestration. * * * and, what is even more serious, defense under article 103 is impossible. That article is no longer in force, because no one to-day obeys orders issued by the district courts, nor even those issued by the supreme court. Federal justice, so called, is a toothless old lady, besmirched and decrepit, gone out of style, at the point of toppling into the grave which has been opened for her. (Excelsior, July 16, 1926.)

We could count on the fingers of one hand the cases in which our history has been written otherwise than in the service of some usurper. In our schools, in our books, in our press, on the platform, everywhere, we have had instilled into us a well-defined official interpretation of our national life. * * * And if, perchance, there has ever arisen a man with courage to study the facts and interpret them contrary to the official standards, * * * he has had to pay for his temerity by rendering homage to the liberty we so loudly proclaim, being sent into exile, as was Bulnes, or thrown into prison, as were the editors of El Tiempo on July 18 of the present year. (Excelsior, December 15, 1926.)

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION SUPPRESSED

There were recently made public two documents of unusual interest. Both documents are extensive. The discussion is ample. The one represents the general conviction not alone of the teachers but of the thousands of families which have been outraged by the imposition on the private schools of the regulations prescribed for them by the Department of Public Education. The other is the expression of the Government's position which, without regard for social standards or even for the most elemental principles of equity, of liberty, and right, is bent upon enforcing in all its severity the law, inflexible and unchanging, with a zeal that is truly fanatic and in strange contrast with the refusal of the authorities themselves either to obey or enforce other

precepts of the same constitution. * * * The constitution of Quere-taro, forged as it was from metal heated in the flames of the basest passion at a time when fanaticism was at its height, has been the law of the land since 1917 under administrations none of which can be said to have been reactionary. * * * By none of these has the law ever been strictly enforced, because it has been realized all along by them that to enforce such laws would meet with determined opposition and, if successful, would put an end to the work of the private schools, whose cooperation no patriotic Mexican can reject so long as 95 per cent of our people are illiterate.

The secretary contends that neither the regulations prescribed by him nor the constitution itself interferes with the natural right of parents to direct the education of their children. * * * His error is fundamental and lies in his contention that laicism is neutral and that therefore the regulations in no way violate the rights of parents to direct the education of their children. These regulations remove the education of children from all parental control precisely at the time when the very foundations of all education must be laid. (*El Pais*, April 16, 1926.)

But even if we accept the claim of the secretary that laicism is non-sectarian, his action loses none of its despotic character. Education begins in the cradle. At his mother's knee the heart of the little one is formed. * * * How can the secretary contend that this sacred right of the parent is preserved and not violated by a decree which, in its enforcement, tears the child from the school which the parent controls to send it to the school conducted by the state, to be returned to the parent only when it has been prepared to enter high school, with its mind loaded down with prejudices, with habits that can never be eradicated, and with its moral standards forever determined? (*El Pais*, April 17, 1926.)

Our education is laical, atheistic, antireligious if we are to call things by their true names, not because the people demand that it be so but because a minority in power despises the religion which the people of Mexico profess. They care nothing for the protests by which parents assert their right to direct the education of their children. (*Excelsior*, February 11, 1927.)

In the schools it would be well if there were more work and less display. It may be all right for boys to have Babe Ruth for their model in baseball and Kid Martinez for their football hero. It may be all right for girls to dance the shimmy with the agility of Eleanor Smith and sing the Borraquita more rhythmically even than Lupe Rivas Cacho. But this should not be allowed to interfere with their learning to read and write. It may be all right for girls to have their pals, their chums, and their friends, but that does not signify that they should not learn to cook and to sew. * * *

In the primary schools the things that are being done would be ludicrous if they were not so tragic. Little boys in the fourth and fifth grades are obliged to memorize the "lay sermon." We are told that this lay sermon is a rival for the letters of Melchor Ocampo to a bride, and the suppression of these is one of the most praiseworthy and most profitable achievements of the revolution. * * * (*Excelsior*, January 31, 1927.)

To-day we wish to dwell briefly on what we consider the reason for the failure of our public-school system. We have before us a textbook. Its use is prescribed for boys and girls of 10. It was prepared by Jose Maria Bonilla. Its title is "Civics." It costs \$1.50. Its use is compulsory for second-grade pupils in all government schools of the "third group."

It treats of such intricate problems as easements, leaseholds, mortgages, and company organizations. It does not leave untouched even such controversial questions as divorce. * * * What can a boy or a girl of 10 do with our civil code, no matter how thoroughly abridged or how well explained? He is totally without preparation for such a study. Even his knowledge of language is inadequate. He may read and reread the text of Mr. Bonilla; he may even commit it to memory, but he will never understand or master it. His time and effort will have been wasted and, what is even worse, the little scholar may become injured from the effort he has made. At the age of 10 he can have neither the physical nor the spiritual maturity required for work of this kind. But even this is not all nor even the more serious. On ethical grounds alone the book is not fit to be in the hands of children. The chapter on the conditions for the granting of divorce in the hands of these children is nothing short of a poem to indecency. How are teachers of the public school going to explain to boys and girls 10 years old the things which in our laws and in this book are listed as conditions for the granting of divorce.

We may be charged with being reactionary, but we are sure that the fathers and mothers of Mexico would a thousand times prefer to have their sons and daughters preserve the innocence of infancy even at the sacrifice of having to remain in ignorance of some of the realities and indecencies of life which, alas, they need not go to school to learn. (*Excelsior*, February 11, 1927.)

The constitution of 1857, regardless of everything said to the contrary by those who call themselves constitutionalists, has been completely sup-

planted by the constitution of 1917, prescribing that education be laical, gratuitous, and compulsory.

The new constitution given to the people of Mexico to elevate and enlighten them contains changes which are revolutionary. It says, simply and boldly, "in the public schools primary education will be gratuitous." That is to say, secondary and higher education may be paid for by the student.

And they are paid for to the scandal of all who, with us, hold that education is a public service of first importance and should be absolutely gratuitous.

We are not speaking of insignificant charges, but of charges which are a heavy burden to the poor who are most in need of the help of the government in their effort to provide for the education of their children.

In the high schools a matriculation of 40 pesos is collected, and that certainly is a sum not easily within the reach of a day laborer with a family to support on his low wages.

But what is worse, Juan Holgum, a teacher in one of these schools, is the author of a textbook on experimental physics which he sells to second-year students for 5 pesos. A pupil who fails to buy this textbook is not permitted to attend the courses.

Another, Mr. Diaz, sells an arithmetic, of which he is the editor, and which is prescribed for first-year students. It is not at all improbable that the purchase of this book is required as a condition for entrance to the school. * * *

Is it not ridiculous to pretend to the nation that unheard-of efforts and sacrifices are being made to promote education while, at the same time, 40 pesos are collected as a matriculation fee in the high schools and a book on physics is sold to the students at 5 pesos? (*Excelsior*, February 5, 1927.)

THE CATHOLIC RESISTANCE TO THE CONSTITUTION AND DECREES

The reason why we have had so often to amend our constitutions, both in their form and in their substance, is due, above all else, to the attempt that has been made to embody in them things which have no place in such a charter. Instead of making a simple declaration of principles and outlining a general plan of organization, an effort has been made to elaborate an all-embracing code like the Pentateuch, the Gospel, or the Koran. Things which are properly material for organic laws, for secondary codes, and for administrative regulations are engrafted into the constitution in a futile attempt to justify the classic name of Magna Charta applied to it. The result is a confusion of details, and when the written code comes face to face with the realities of practical life it is found to be a tissue of incompatibilities and a fruitful source of controversy and hatred.

The provisions of the constitution of 1917 are not yet all in force, and already there is a demand for amendments of a substantial character. We hold that the constitution not only can but should be amended whenever the welfare of the nation or the voice of a majority of the people expressed clearly and regularly requires that it be amended. (*El Universal*, April 19, 1926.)

The orders that have lately been issued have provoked a collision between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. * * * The church exercising the right, which, by human as well as by divine law, belongs to her, with a moderation that does her credit, asks that the laws be modified; that the constitution be amended so as to remove effectively every obstacle which prevents the full exercise of the authority which properly belongs to either power, preserving at the same time intact the rights and prerogatives of both.

In our opinion the demand for the amendment of the constitution is entirely reasonable. And there should be no difficulty in reaching an agreement because the method that has been proposed is both simple and fair. The demand is made in a spirit of justice which requires that to everyone be given and made secure that which by right is his.

Time and again it has been charged that the church interferes with things not properly belonging to her sphere of action. Why do those who make the charge never refer to specific cases? If they did this, it would be possible to bring out the facts by discussion and thus determine who is right and who is wrong. So long as the charge is general and vague there can be only uncertainty, nothing can be proved, and no definite conclusion can be arrived at. * * * How are you ever going to prove that the church goes beyond the sphere of her legitimate action when she demands liberty to teach? Who can deny that the clergy have a right to be interested in education? * * * And what we say with regard to education can, with equal justice, be said with regard to every question that has been raised in this controversy. The church is in no way seeking to invade a field that does not belong to her. Standing firmly on her own rights, armed only with justice, repudiating all violence, the church demands that to God there be given "that which is God's." * * * (*La Controversia*, September 26, 1926.)

The Attorney General in a recent circular interprets (?) the second paragraph of article 24 of the constitution, which reads: "Every religious act of public worship shall be performed strictly within the churches and these shall be at all times under Government supervision."

Worship is of two kinds, public and private. The constitution orders that all acts of public worship be "performed strictly within the churches." The constitution is silent with regard to acts of private worship.

With what authority, therefore, does the Attorney General hold it to be an offense against the law, a crime, for a priest to perform an act of worship such as the celebration of the mass, the marriage ceremony, baptism, etc., in private homes from which the public is excluded? (Excelsior, February 18, 1927.)

We hold it to be illogical and unsocial to make of the constitution an idol, as do some Mexican politicians, who look upon it as a thing too sacred to be touched by man, like the Koran, before which the faithful bow in daily homage. * * * There can be no such thing as an immutable human law, as some pretend. All laws enacted by man are subject to change. Every act of man is subject to error, and, therefore, to correction, and with far more reason is this true of an act performed under excitement as was the drafting of our constitution in surroundings which precluded the very possibility of keen judgment and by men who acted under impulses which sprang from basest of passions.

There are those who seem to think that the standards of civilization can be changed by law, that the spirit of a people can be altered by the imposition of this or that precept as if the law were a mold into which the soul of the nation can be formed. Nowhere in history do we find a single example of legislation which, being imposed upon an unwilling people, has had the power to bring about its own infusion into the spiritual nature of that people. (El Pais, April 21, 1926.)

Once more the teaching of history is confirmed and the Catholic Church is again, as she has always been, the staunch defender of human rights and liberty.

The bishops of Mexico * * * have addressed themselves to competent authority demanding, as they have a right to demand, liberty and justice not for themselves alone, but for all. * * * "What is it that we ask," they say, "not tolerance, not condescension, above all, not favor nor privilege. We demand liberty, we demand liberty alone, and we demand that liberty for every religion." * * * The church demands only liberty, liberty with justice and law, liberty of thought, liberty of conscience, liberty of education, liberty of worship, liberty of property. (La Controversia, September 12, 1926.)

One of the first acts of the new Chamber of Deputies has been the rejection of the petition in which the Catholic bishops ask for the amendment of the constitution of the Republic. This action is a surprise to no one, certainly not to the bishops who signed the petition. What would have been a surprise would have been for the Congress to have devoted itself to the study of that document with the care and zeal demanded by its importance. But it never occurred to us that the deputies would reject this petition on grounds so futile, so unworthy of a body which speaks of itself as the representative of the nation, but which, in reality, represents nothing but the ambitions of a few men without principle and without ideals. * * * Eulalio Martinez was the only deputy who made any attempt at an argument. Deputy Martinez had a suspicion that those who signed the memorial had compromised themselves in the manner prohibited by the constitution and, therefore, he argued that they had forfeited their citizenship and with it their right of petition. This argument is sophistic, and the man making it is ignorant of the first principles of justice. No one should be judged without a hearing and certainly not condemned on mere "suspicion." * * * Before anyone can have the right to declare that Bishop Mora and Bishop Diaz have forfeited their Mexican citizenship, a formal investigation must be held to ascertain the facts and there must, at least, be a definite charge that the bishops have pledged themselves in a manner prohibited by the constitution.

But such "little things" as these, although in other countries they are held to be of great importance, among us are ridiculed as absurd scruples, which, like withered leaves in the whirlwind, are to be swept away by the onrushing torrent of radicalism which engulfs us.

We are not defending the memorial of the Catholics. That is not the subject of this editorial. We leave that to the million of Catholics, whose names, attached to the voluminous memorials that have been rejected, constitute the best evidence of the low esteem in which the will of the people is held in our Republic.

But one voice of the chamber was raised in opposition. It was the voice of a newspaper man. He, alone, voted against the committee report by which the bishops' memorial was rejected. And, oh, how our colleague was insulted. Never before had he listened to such abusive language even from the tongues of market women. * * * He was not permitted to develop his reasons for holding that the memorial should be considered. He was heckled and interrupted by the members. * * * We have a right to expect that any assembly, and above all, an assembly which pretends to represent the people, adopt for its first rule to be obeyed on all occasions that every member of the assembly be assured an opportunity to speak. * * * How is the chamber to function at all if its members are to be denied the right to speak? (Excelsior, September 27, 1926.)

It has been nine long years since the constitution of Queretaro was published, and even during that time the full scope and significance

of that legislation have not yet been determined with precision. None of us, not even the Government itself, have ever doubted that that legislation, like so many others, was destined to remain a mere scrap of paper. Out of this fact springs the conflict. The Government, on the one hand, now contends that laws are enacted to be obeyed and it is the duty of public authorities to enforce them. The church, on the other hand, contends that this law, enacted at a time of great political excitement, never having been enforced, is now no longer applicable and must sooner or later be amended. * * *

As we see it, the best interests of the country require that this controversy be brought to an early close. We do not speak especially of the material interests. The spiritual welfare of the country is involved in this controversy. * * *

Can we be charged with partisanship if we say that our most earnest desire is that an end be put to this disagreement which threatens again to disrupt the union of the Mexican family? Can we be accused of any wrong if we add our voice to that of those who demand a solution of this problem which has again arisen?

A few days ago the press of the United States published a statement by the Bishop of Tabasco. That prelate was quoted as having said: "The bishops, the clergy, and the Catholic people of Mexico hold the fundamental laws and the authority of the Government in as high esteem as any man." This can mean only one thing, and we here make record of the fact that the Catholic Church in Mexico has no intention whatever to rise in rebellion against laws which are in this way, by one of its best-informed spokesmen, declared to be held in esteem by it. This statement eliminates the most serious of all the difficulties of this controversy. * * * There remains, however, another point raised by the Bishop of Tabasco. It is the consideration of the fact that the law violates not only interests, but rights alike, rights which * * * are held to be inalienable in countries having liberal institutions. In a case like this, says the bishop, criticism of the law is in order. It is not illegal. It certainly is not an act of rebellion. Respect for the law can prevent no one from pointing out the defects of the law.

Practically the same thought is found in another statement, that of the President of the Republic, which also was recently published in the American press. * * * Bishop Diaz said: "If, as a result of the progress achieved by the country or for any other reason, it becomes necessary to amend a law, it can be amended and the means for amending it are provided by the law itself."

President Calles said: "The President admits the possibility of amending the law, and it is clear that before the law can be amended it must be subjected to criticism."

Thus, in principle, at least, are brought together the two views which seemed divided and utterly irreconcilable. * * *

Fortunately, the day of religious wars is passed. Tolerance is a characteristic of every civilized nation and liberty of conscience is held as a thing sacred and inviolable, the supreme expression of spiritual liberty. The same Catholic Church, having accepted this condition and living in it, makes no attempt to dominate the temporal power even in countries where her followers are in the majority. It is not conceivable, therefore, that she should adopt a different attitude in Mexico. * * * (Excelsior, August 14, 1926.)

What really is at the bottom of this religious controversy is a difference of opinion with regard to our present laws. The Catholics refuse to accept certain clauses of the constitution and certain regulations by which the Government seeks to put these into effect. The proper thing, therefore, was to discuss these laws, as it appears the C. R. O. M. and the League for the Defense of Religious Liberty proposed to do, but to discuss "The Church and the Mexican Revolution," as did Mr. Luis Leon, can have no other purpose and serve no other end than that of inflaming the passions and making the discord even deeper than it already is. Such disputes are utterly futile. * * * Nothing but that which is actually before us should have been introduced into this discussion.

General Calles, himself, in a recent telegram to the Evening Post, of New York, admitted, without reserve, that Catholics in Mexico enjoy the right of petition, and that certainly means the right to ask for the amendment of the law by which their liberty is restricted. If those who defend the policy of the Government really believe that in Mexico there is true religious liberty, true liberty of education, true liberty of worship, there is ample room for an argument dealing only with concrete things and from such an argument much enlightenment might flow as a result. (Excelsior, August 3, 1926.)

There are those who are more Callista than Calles himself. They are to be found in Saltillo, in Cecilia, near Tampico, and in other parts of the Republic. We say this because the policy of the central Government with regard to religion which has been clearly announced by both the President and his Attorney General is to keep all churches open in order that the faithful may in them engage in their exercises or devotion. In the places above mentioned the local authorities have driven the Catholics from the churches with violence and abuses.

The Secretary of Gobernacion in a circular has disapproved this as an excess of Jacobinism, which he holds to be contrary to the policies of the Federal Government. But the secretary should do more than issue

this paternal reprimand. It is his duty to enforce the law with the severity he shows on other occasions. * * * Did the alcalde of Cecilia offend against no law when, gun in hand, he drove the Catholics from the church, abusing them in an insulting and cowardly manner? Did the Saltillo authorities commit no crime when they obliged the Catholics to sweep the streets of their town for no better reason than that they had been found assembled in a church? And what has the Secretary of Gobernacion done? He has sent his fatherly counsels to the guilty, who, doubtless, will go on doing the same things every time the opportunity presents itself. (Excelsior, August 21, 1926.)

Perhaps the worst abuse which the Catholics have had to support is to be found in the penalties that are being imposed on those who worship in their homes. This is a violation of the constitution. Article 24 reads: "Everyone is free to embrace the religion of his choice and to practice all ceremonies, devotions, or observances of his respective creed, whether in places of public worship or at home." To defend his rights is the duty of every man. The attitude assumed by the Catholics is in no sense excessive. In taking it they are within the law. They have done nothing which is not permitted by the law when they have organized for the purpose of bringing to bear on Congress all the influence they have in favor of the amendments which they have proposed. As yet we have no clear evidence that the legislators will open their eyes to the real demands of the Mexican people. (Restauracion, September 9, 1926.)

Our constitution prohibits the formation of any political party in whose name there is any word or symbol by which it is related to any religious creed. That constitution does not, however, prohibit, nor can it ever prohibit, to the Catholics of Mexico the exercise of the political rights which are theirs by virtue of their Mexican citizenship.

Under the constitution the citizen is free to profess the religious faith which he prefers. The liberty to believe and to be affiliated with any church coexists with the rights of the citizen to engage in activities of a civil character. These two rights are not in conflict. The one in no manner excludes the other.

Yesterday we published an interview in which the Archbishop of Durango stated clearly the position of Catholics on this question.

Liberty can not long survive in a democracy where there are no political parties, no contest between platforms based on principles and not on personal interests and ambitions. * * * We long for the day when Mexico will enjoy as she should to-day enjoy * * * this, the normal condition of every true democracy. Political parties in Mexico exist only in embryo. There are no platforms; we do not mean one-sided, narrow programs, but programs broad in their scope and embodying the conflicting theories held by their members regarding the manner in which our social problems would be solved; theories which in their definition of, as well as in their mode of handling, these problems are, of necessity, conflicting and thus give rise to controversy which is wholesome and productive of good.

One of these problems, and certainly not the least important, is the demand for the amendment of the religious clauses of the constitution. Therefore, we find both reasonable and opportune the exhortation which the Archbishop of Durango addresses to the Catholics of Mexico calling upon them to do their duty politically and exercise effectively the rights which flow naturally from that duty. * * *

The Catholics have no desire nor intention to organize a political party of a religious character. The action which they have a right to take and which is guaranteed to them as citizens under the law is that of directing the current of public opinion, of which they are an important factor, thus bringing about the inclusion of this demand as an integral part of the program of those secular parties which make up the political life of the nation. (El Universal, May 22, 1926.)

TYRANNY AND CRUELTY RULE MEXICO, THE VERDICT OF THE MEXICAN PRESS

REIGN OF TERROR IN MEXICO

The systematic application of extreme penalties by men subject to no restraint is a thing which we can not accept. * * * Such a thing should be tolerated only in exceptional cases at a time when the national safety is in danger or when the public peace is disturbed. * * * We demand leniency for no one; at times severe measures are necessary for the protection of society. But we do demand that the law itself be respected. * * * An authority which knowingly violates the law, * * * easily becomes accustomed to this and in the end recognizes no law other than its own caprice. Citizens who meekly endure or even who are made to witness such a systematic disregard for law soon lose their respect for all authority. Seeing justice prostituted, they soon lose even the esteem they might have inherited for justice itself.

Thus is public morality undermined, the rule of force set up, and the sense of right destroyed. Thus are men reduced to their primitive savagery. * * *

We demand not only the suppression of all those direct and arbitrary acts which are being imposed contrary to law but we demand that the law itself be respected by those who are called upon to enforce it. * * * (El Universal, April 26, 1926.)

EXECUTIONS IN COLIMA

Yesterday we published a news item from Colima regarding abuses, for which no condemnation is too severe, which had been committed by Gen. Benito Garcia and the officers under his command. At first it was reported that a plot against the Government had been discovered, and that eight of the conspirators had been executed by General Garcia. Such an execution even as this, without trial, without having given the victims an opportunity to make any defense, no matter what may be said in explanation, is simply murder and deserves nothing but our condemnation.

But now we know that no such plot ever existed at all, and that the killing of these men was a bloody orgy, a crime of the worst sort, against which the voice of an outraged society should be raised in protest, demanding that the guilty ones be brought to justice. How are we ever going to convince people in other countries that we are a civilized nation if we confide authority to men capable of murder as these men were at Colima, where eight innocent and peaceful persons were done to death, feloniously and willfully, with malice and extreme cruelty and every aggravating circumstance? (Excelsior, September 14, 1926.)

ASSASSINATIONS AT NAYARIT

Not long ago we brought to the attention of the higher authorities certain murders which had been committed at Colima by a high-ranking officer of the army. We submitted proofs, which the officer accused has never denied, and the criminal continues to enjoy the emoluments and privileges of his office. * * * Now we have to report that the example of Colima has been imitated at Nayarit. * * * The victims this time are not simple, defenseless private citizens. These are assassinated on the most futile pretexts, as happened in Colima, where, in last analysis, the only excuse offered was the fact the assassin had been drinking alcohol to such an extent that he no longer had control of his reason. * * *

We are daily informed in official statements that we are not in a state of revolution, but of full constitutionality; that Mexico is a nation governed under the law by men who are the legitimate representatives of the people. * * * There can, therefore, be no excuse for authorities who commit crimes such as that reported from Nayarit. Although in the Colima case our voice was lost as that of "one crying in the wilderness," we now hope that the Secretary of War will take action against those who are responsible for this new crime. * * *

All bounds have been exceeded by the abuses that are daily being committed on the pretext of conspiracies, later shown to be imaginary. It is, indeed, carrying things to great extremes when an order of amparo is treated as a joke by authorities whose names we do not mention, for whom there is no law but the law of force. * * * (Excelsior, December 16, 1926.)

THE CYCLONE OF POLITICAL CRIME

We can no longer remain silent in face of the wave of violence which, like a veritable cyclone of political crime, is sweeping over the Republic. It may to some seem wasted effort to go on as we have been doing, insisting on publishing the political assaults which day after day are repeated and which, in spite of all the protests that have been made, seem to be increasing.

It is to us a duty, as it is a solemn obligation of every citizen, to do everything within our power to bring to an end the epidemic of murders which, if it goes on unchecked, must in the end reduce us definitely to a state of savagery. No other action being possible, we can appeal only to the courts, but we must never grow faint in that appeal. Weak and ineffective as that defense may seem to-day, in the end it will be irresistible. Respect for human life must be restored if the life of our nation is to be preserved.

In far-off Nayarit the tragedy assumes proportions such as to satisfy even a Caesar Borgia. A senator and practically every member of his family have fallen, put to death while in the very act of appealing to the military authorities for protection. * * * One crime seems to beget another. * * * We now have a telegram from the officer in command at Nayarit reporting to the Secretary of War that he is in danger of being assassinated by a justice of the supreme court, who, together with a member of the State legislature and other officials of the local government, have threatened him. We can only leave to the imagination of our readers the task of forming their own notion of the fear and anxiety which will be expressed in the telegrams which, as an SOS from some sinking ship, must even at this moment be coming in from the men who have thus been accused.

But even closer to home we have seen carried through our own streets the dead body of one who, only a few days ago, was the representative of labor in congress. The circumstances in which he was killed are not yet fully known. He was shot in the back while he was engaged in the performance of his official duty during the elections that were held last Sunday.

To make this picture complete, we recall the municipal official at San Angel, who, being carried off by a mob, was tied to a tree and riddled with bullets.

We do not desire to be sensational. Far from exaggerating, we have omitted the most shocking details and have limited ourselves to a cold

recital of a few simple facts of recent occurrence already known to the public. These crimes can not be justified. * * * They are an evidence of the moral disease from which the nation is suffering. They are to be traced to two causes: The refusal of political parties to comply with the law and the failure of the authorities to bring the guilty to justice. (El Universal, December 16, 1926.)

EXECUTIONS AT LEON

Since the crime committed in Nayarit * * * no further complaint against the army for shootings of this sort have for some time been received, but now, not 1 nor 2 but 11 people are reported to have been assassinated at Leon. In a statement issued by the Undersecretary of War, we are told "the federal troops became involved together with the municipal authorities in a fight against an armed body of Catholics, who are believed to be a part of a band which committed the assault on San Francisco del Rincon," and that the War Department could assume no responsibility nor take any action with regard to these executions because they had been ordered by the civil authorities.

What authority had the municipal officials to order these executions? What authority have municipal officials? What are their duties? What right had they to usurp functions which belong to the courts of justice? How, we demand, is it that municipal officials in a place like Leon, in utter disregard for every other authority, including the army, have had the temerity to destroy the lives of 11 persons, every one of whom, it seems, was a resident of that city? (El Universal, January 6, 1927.)

THE WAY OF BLOOD

At no time in our history has the death penalty been free from abuses. * * * This fact, greatly to our discredit, is now manifesting itself in a truly alarming manner. All rights and guarantees seem to be suspended. Justice and law are treated as playthings, subject to the caprice and violence of even low-ranking army officers or simple alcaldes in the most insignificant townships.

In recent reports of encounters with rebel bands we no longer find the term "summary." Executions are now described as immediate and their victims are almost without exception civilians. * * * Respect for human life seems to have disappeared altogether in our country. * * *

Shootings are the order of the day. We could cite many cases in support of that statement. We will, however, refer only to one which because of the public scandal aroused and the cruel, barbarous, inhuman, and illegal manner in which it was perpetrated has aroused the most profound indignation of the people.

A correspondent whom we know to be worthy of every esteem, who was an eyewitness of the facts, describes them in a letter we received from Leon. * * * He says an attack was made on the town of Leon on Monday, January 3. The affair, he says "seemed at first to be of no significance, but now it does assume importance when there becomes known some of the blood-curdling details of the manner in which five boys, all under 20 years, were executed."

"These victims were Jose Valencia Gallardo, Salvador Vargas, Nicolas Navarro, Ezequiel Gomez, and one other named Rios. They were boys of good character. Seduced by no one knows what influence, they may have taken part in this adventure, but whether that be so or not, there is no excuse for the fact that they were killed like dogs and subjected to cruel torture before being shot."

These boys were arrested on the morning after the attack. At the time they were not armed. "A detachment of mounted gendarmes," the letter continues, "captured them and, driving them to the center of the town, shot them almost immediately without preferring any charges against them or making any investigation whatever." * * * "Before the volley was fired, one of these boys, losing courage, broke in tears. Valencia Gallardo, who, from the moment of his arrest, had manifested great courage, tried to comfort him. Then, turning to his companions, he called upon them to place their trust in God. Infuriated, the gendarmes seized him and, tearing out his tongue, shot him."

"The gendarmes placed the bodies on public exhibition at the main entrance to the Municipal Palace. It was an awful sight. While the bodies lay there in a great pool of blood, their relatives were scarcely able to make their way to them so great was the crowd that had assembled. No words can describe that scene."

Once more, we demand, Are crimes like this to go unpunished as did those committed at Colima and at Acaponeta? Are they to be repeated at other places in the Republic? Have the authorities finally adopted for their policy the summary execution of their victims without trial or hearing, in defiance of all law and of all the standards of civilization? (Excelsior, January 13, 1927.)

THE CONSTITUTION FLOUTED AGAIN

Can Mexico truly be said to enjoy a régime of law at the present time? Are the acts of Mexicans controlled by and in conformity with the principles of law and justice which our own constitution embodies?

If we may base our judgment on the things which are every day happening among us on the treatment, not only illegal, but immoral, inhuman, brutally oppressive, which the Government is meting out to

some Mexicans, we can reach no other conclusion than that the political constitution of the United States of Mexico has been suspended.

Let us look the facts in the face. At Colima, without even the semblance of a trial, men are shot to death; if we are to speak plainly, assassinated. In Nayarit, an entire family perished barbarously; at Leon, to complete the picture of black savagery, there was wanting nothing but the banquet at which the flesh of the victims could have been devoured.

But that is not all. Only yesterday, the public read in our columns the account of the shooting of 27 individuals carried out with no more formality than a simple order from the Secretary of War.

We are not alarmed particularly about the fact that the death penalty is being inflicted in Mexico. Our constitution sanctions the death penalty. But that which does fill us with alarm is the fact that Mexicans are being put to death with no formality or trial whatever, without being permitted to make any defense, in violations of our own laws.

We do not raise the question here as to whether or not those who are being shot have by their crimes merited the death penalty. We are even willing, for sake of argument, to admit that these men who, only the other day, were done to death by the Government, were all criminals of the worst kind. We are willing to admit that their elimination was a service to the public and a credit to the fair name of the nation and a protection to the peace of the community. But even criminals are human beings. They are not savage beasts. They are not mere things to be disposed of at the caprice of those in power and, as human beings, they have a right to the protection of our laws. * * *

How are we to account for this flouting of the law by our Government in its dealings with the people?

Doubtless, there is not a self-respecting man in Mexico to-day but who, in fear and trembling, is asking himself that question, than which none more momentous could be asked. It must be apparent to everyone that this matter is one which affects the very life of our nation which is impossible if there is to be no respect for the constitution and no justice in the enforcement of the law.

What has the Government to say? Will it say anything? Will it remain silent? * * * Whatever it does, there is only one way in which it can restore quiet to the public mind, and that is by giving some tangible and irrefutable evidence of a practical character that here in Mexico the relations that are to exist between the people and their Government are not to be those which are found among savage nations, but those which are found among peoples of enlightenment. It must show by facts that are indisputable that human life is respected in Mexico in the manner prescribed by our constitution. (Excelsior, February 2, 1927.)

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN MEXICO

Article 22 of the constitution is perfectly clear. Its third paragraph reads: "Capital punishment is likewise forbidden for all political offenses; in the case of offenses other than political it shall only be imposed for high treason committed during a foreign war, parricide, murder with malice aforethought, arson, abduction, highway robbery, piracy, and grave military offenses."

To demand that this provision of the law be obeyed with the same scruple as is being shown in the enforcement of the clauses referring to education and to religion would be like going to a thorn tree for apples, and we are not so ingenuous as to insist on the letter of the law.

Civilians in great numbers are being subjected to the military law in all its severity. These civilians, we insist, are not armed rebels. They are noncombatants. They have been charged with nothing but conspiracy. Only a few days ago in Michoacan a man whose name was Calderon, a civilian, widely known, was arrested in spite of the fact that he was known to be leading a peaceful life. He was shot in defiance of the law and of the rights which, under the law, are guaranteed to him. * * *

We have seen reports from army men which would be ludicrous were it not for the awfulness of the tragedy to which they refer. In these reports we find these men gloating over executions, boasting cynically of shootings which they have executed in defiance of the law, as though these were the glorious deeds of some victory won on the field of battle. * * * Unfortunate though it may be, we can only admit the fact that there is left in our country only one foundation upon which national morality stands, * * * respect for the law. If respect for the law is lost, if the laws are no longer obeyed by our army, military discipline will disappear and our army will degenerate until it is no better than a band of marauders attached by fear or favor to some chieftain whom it may desert at any time. More important to the Government and to the nation even than the annihilation of conspirators and the suppression of rebellion is the maintenance of discipline and the respect for law in the army. Experience gained through a long and painful history is proof enough of this. (Excelsior, March 1, 1927.)

SUMMARY EXECUTIONS

If we were to ask ourselves what has the Government of the Republic done in its action against rebellion to extenuate the ferocity which, serving no useful end, invariably is aroused in Mexico by what should

not be more than a mere political controversy, we would, unfortunately, find it necessary to confess that it has done nothing, absolutely nothing, of a practical character.

There is no one who does not know the savage violence with which the campaign in Jalisco is being waged. There is no one who does not know the carefree manner in which large numbers of men are being shot in many other parts of the country. Chiefs of operations, commanding officers, even officers of low rank in command of mere detachments, are condemning to death combatants and noncombatants with a nonchalance that one would expect only of highwaymen and bandits. As has always been the case, to-day the number of those slaughtered is far greater than those killed on the field of conflict. * * *

The most recent example of a killing executed many kilometers away from the scene of battle occurred in Morelia, Michoacan. The victim was Mr. Alfonso Arce, a citizen who stood high in that community. The facts reported indicated that, on the 10th of the present month, a band of rebels entered the village of Puruandiro. Mr. Arce, as is proven by the facts which were not disproved, was in Morelia on the 9th and continuously thereafter. He could not, therefore, have been present at the attack on Puruandiro. Nevertheless, it was enough for some one to denounce to the officer in command of the detachment at Morelia Arce as a participant in that attack to cause his arrest on the 12th, followed by his execution within 24 hours without any trial nor any effort to verify the charges. * * *

For a government like ours which pretends, above all else, to be a government of law enforcement, the constitution should alone be the guide. If the government holds that the constitutional guarantees stand in the way of the restoration of order, article 29 of the constitution tells it what it must do. By that article, the executive must go to the permanent committee of congress with a request that these guarantees be declared in suspension. It must defend that request before the nation and, in the briefest time possible, put an end to this abnormal condition by suppressing the rebellion. But, if the Government holds that this action is not necessary, it has a solemn obligation to do everything possible to restrain the ferocity of its officers, who, like jackals, are devastating the Republic by giving free reign to their bloodthirsty instincts. (El Universal, April 18, 1927.)

MEXICO A BANKRUPT DEMOCRACY

LEGISLATION

We Mexicans make of the law a sort of fetish. We do not indeed always obey the law, but in speaking of it we laud its efficacy to the heavens. No matter what problem arises, our first thought is to pass a new law. We seem to legislate for the sake of legislating, to-day in one direction, to-morrow in another. We seem to feel that the mere inscription of a proposition in our laws is sufficient to work miracles. * * *

Thus, we have gone on passing laws since the day of our independence. Congresses have come and Congresses have gone since the days of Apatzingan and we have pursued our merry course of law making. If we were to stack all of our laws one upon another, we would have a mountain of laws. Constitution upon constitution, regulation upon regulation, reforms great and small, we have never stopped, nor is there now any sign that we are about to stop legislating.

And what is worse, we seem to learn nothing from experience. Even now we are not sure that it is not the law from which national customs spring rather than the reverse. The result is that our legislation, far from serving to standardize and crystallize the habits we have developed, thus having its roots in our traditions and being a true reflection of our national character and the conditions in which we live, is more apt to be the expression of some exalted idealism or, what is worse, to have no idealism at all, being mere schemes of men who, though not generally in office, have great political influence, seeking only their own interests, having no inspiration but that of their own caprice, subject to no control, enforcing their own notions of that which suits their purpose best.

It is not to be wondered at that so many of our laws have been dead letters from the day of their enactment. It could not be otherwise, because of the unjust and unpractical things they embody. It is not strange that in our legislation we find much that is exotic, borrowed from abroad and almost nothing that is original, national, nor are we to wonder when we find that when an attempt is made to enforce these laws, which are utterly out of harmony with conditions, the result is opposition, disorder, and conspiracy. (El Universal, July 15, 1926.)

To-day we publish an item in our news columns which in other countries would go unnoticed, but which among us is truly sensational. The president of the Chamber of Deputies of the State of Nuevo Leon, Rodolfo Hinajoso, has suspended action on a bill providing for the enforcement of article 130 of the constitution until an opportunity has been given to the people to make known their will regarding the provisions of this bill.

With all sincerity we confess that when this item came to our attention we doubted if such a thing could really have occurred anywhere in

the Republic of Mexico. We have seen the will of the people treated with such contempt, the petitions of the nation so often flouted, that we could not bring ourselves to believe that there might still be found even one honorable man whose action is a credit to his title of representative of the people.

In our legislation the thing least thought of is the people. Party advantage, the will of caciques, these are carefully considered in the inner circles, but it never by any chance occurs to anyone in our Government to give the least thought to how his action will be received by the people. (El Pais, Apr. 15, 1926.)

THE COURTS

Passing in review the hopes and aspirations around which the revolution of 1910 was fought and which gave to it its truly popular character, we recall the prophetic words of Justo Sierra: "The people hunger and thirst after justice." * * *

The revolution of 1910 inscribed on its banners in flaming characters one reform in demanding which, above all else, the nation was united—the reform of the courts of justice. The solemn pledge was given to the people that thenceforth the rights of all would be safeguarded. It was declared that favoritism was at an end forever and that the new régime would insure absolute integrity, with perfect equality guaranteed to all men before the law. The law thenceforth would be supreme and all the relations between man and man or man and the government made subject to it, without discrimination and without regard to political affiliations. * * *

It is all the more painful, therefore, now that 16 years have passed since the people of Mexico were inspired by that demand to deeds of heroism, to have to record the fact that the people have been defrauded, that all the sufferings have been in vain, useless all the sacrifices. * * * In the administration of justice we have made no advance toward the high ideals of 1910. We are confronted with the same immorality in our courts, the same contempt for the law. We can only confess that in this, as in so many other things, the aspirations of the revolution are still unrealized. We have exhausted our energies in an effort that has borne no fruit, that has been a failure.

To-day we are not only no better off, but our condition is even more deplorable than it was in 1910. Judges, prosecutors, magistrates, all are guilty at least of excessive leniency, if indeed they have not rendered themselves justly liable to the charge of corruption which on all sides is being brought against them. Under the revolution, justice, like democracy itself, is a farce and a fraud, and this we can only confess and lament.

Postrevolutionary justice is in bankruptcy. Corruption dominates many of the courts. In some of these judgments are sold to the highest bidder. The citizen finds himself defenseless, at the mercy of the police and the army. (El Universal, Oct. 2, 1926.)

Justice is sold. It is hired out. No one who cares to take the trouble finds it difficult to violate justice. Justice is cheated miserably. Immorality has reached the point where cases in our courts are no longer won by consideration of the law, but only by the consideration of the size of the bribe that is offered.

This is no idle talk. We are not making charges we can not prove. * * * The officers of the army, especially, have had nothing but contempt for the decrees of the so-called federal courts. So brazenly has the law been flouted time and again that even the supreme court recently found it necessary to order action to be taken against army officers who refuse to comply with the decisions of courts in the federal district. * * * But we have no reason to expect that, in the case of some of these officials, even the supreme court will press for action. We can only feel that, here again, the law is to be enforced only against those who are without influence or without wealth as, for instance, the alcalde of Tepetlaxco, and not enforced against those who have power.

Things can not go on as they are without plunging the nation into lawlessness and anarchy. (Excelsior, October 8, 1926.)

It is absolutely necessary that something be done at once to reform the courts of justice. No action can be too severe against judges who prostitute their office and tolerate corruption in their courts. Their crime is worse than that of the thieves, who without mercy are thrown into prison; it is worse even than the crimes of highwaymen, who are being shot down at sight.

Society can live without paved roads, without agricultural schools, without great irrigation works, admirable and useful as all these are, but society can not long survive the death of justice. (Excelsior, November 11, 1926.)

SUFFRAGE

Accounts which have appeared in the daily press show that already more than 300 men have presented credentials showing themselves to have been elected to the chamber of deputies at the recent elections. There is every reason to believe that when all the credentials issued have been presented there will be on hand enough pretenders to make up two or three chambers. We have grown used to this, and would think nothing of it were it not for the fact that this year the announcement that the chief executive of the nation himself would exercise the most scrupulous vigilance over the elections and that he would sup-

press all fraud and abuses led us to hope that, at last, we might see a change of the system. * * *

In our country the holding of elections is a difficult and complicated undertaking because of the great mass of citizens are incapable of understanding even the meaning of public suffrage or of manifesting any interest in the exercise of their political rights.

The election laws are complicated. The preelection campaign is a campaign of lies and falsehoods. The freedom of the ballot is always subject to the arbitrariness of subordinate officials and to the violence of those who balk at nothing in their determination to remain in office. The result is that elections held in Mexico are fraudulent and, judged by the standards of our own law, productive of no valid results. That is why conscientious men have ceased to have anything to do with elections, having reached the conclusion that, after all, these elections exercise no influence over public administration. * * * As stated above, 300 credentials have already been presented. Two or three times this number will be presented before the end is reached. How many crimes, how many deeds of violence, how many irregularities have been committed throughout the Republic to make this possible, and what measures is the Minister of Gobernacion going to adopt against those in office and out of office who have committed them? (Excelsior, July 15, 1926.)

To call oneself a democrat is easy, but to be a democrat in Mexico is all but impossible, especially to those in office. Nevertheless, the time has come when the revolution must give some evidence of respect for the will of the people and that, at least with regard to our elections, some advancement is being made. (Excelsior, August 21, 1926.)

Formerly no elections at all were held in Mexico because it was useless to hold elections. People had grown tired of the comedy, knowing perfectly well that the list of deputies and senators who would in the end hold office had already been prepared in the office of the Secretary of Gobernacion.

To-day, likewise, no elections are held in Mexico. The people have learned that the results of the elections are determined not at the polls but in the Office of Gobernacion or by some inner circle of the Congress itself; to-day, whether a pretender has a credential or not, whether he has received votes or not, whether he is qualified or not, provided only that he is looked upon with favor by the powers that be, nothing can prevent him from taking his seat.

Having lost all faith in the integrity of the ballot, the people have no confidence in the elections, and improvement will not be possible until the faith of the people and its confidence in this, the highest function of democracy, is restored. (El Universal, July 15, 1926.)

The all-important thing in our decadent democracy in Mexico is not the ballot. Candidates make little or no effort to win votes. Their only worry is to gain control of the man who presides at the election booth. To accomplish this they are willing to resort to chicanery and even to violence, knowing perfectly well that these men, having authority to pass on the results of the election, will substitute whatever votes may be lacking.

The chairman of the committee is in reality the one elector, the one important agent in this pseudo-democratic function, the election in Mexico.

All the energies of our political parties are devoted to winning the control of these men. Election boards are reduced to servility by bribery and threats. It is commonly said among the people that men on these boards have to face \$10,000 or daggers 10. Election booths are assaulted with impunity and ballot boxes openly purloined.

This is not democracy; it is a brutal abuse of the suffrage which our politicians go on committing with utter contempt of the popular will. (El Universal, November 17, 1926.)

CITIZENSHIP

Under the name of Civil Union for the Defense of Liberty there has been organized a new group which proposes to take up the defense of liberty both of the individual and of society. The organizers are conservative men of high ideals. They have already held several meetings and they now make public the principles for which the new organization is to stand.

Social problems, they declare, are not to be solved by war. Strife and violence bring only destruction and are the fruitful sources from which spring crime, poverty, and anarchy.

The deplorable crisis through which the Republic is now passing has come to us precisely as the fruit of bloody revolution and is due, above all, to the fact that those to whom the masses had a right to look for leadership, through cowardice, indifference, and selfishness have held themselves aloof.

We have no just complaint. If we are slaves, it is because we have not known the value nor been willing to pay the price of liberty. Abuses most degrading have been heaped upon us, and instead of standing for our rights we have had recourse only to mean and cowardly grumblings.

Seeing victory go so often to force, we have lost faith in the efficacy of moral measures. We have failed to understand that the victory of material force is never lasting and that in the end liberty and justice are sure to assert themselves.

Tyrannies that seemed impregnable in the past, but which did not stand on the firm foundation of moral truth, have been overthrown by an opposition seemingly powerless, but strong, nevertheless, in the fact that it stood for right. Our defense, therefore, must depend not on arms nor on the shedding of blood but on the development of those forces of morality and culture which, seated in the soul of the nation, alone in the end can do away forever with the rule of force and the imposition of tyranny in the hands of a minority. * * * The Mexican problem is essentially a social, a moral problem. Proposals and plans without number and of infinite variety have been advanced for its solution. All have failed because none in its practical working out has elevated the ethical character of the people. * * *

Throughout our history we have resorted to war as the final arbiter of all our disputes. We have had nothing but contempt for education as a factor of our national progress. We have sought to transform the people on the field of battle, and we have only intensified the instincts of hatred and destruction. * * *

The Civil Union for the Defense of Liberty has been formed for the purpose of undertaking an organized campaign, the purpose of which will be the promotion of citizenship and civic virtue throughout the country in the defense of liberty and rights. The new union is not a political party. It has no desire for office. It has no political purpose. Its action will at all times be in compliance with the law. It seeks to accomplish results that will be lasting. It strikes at the root of our national problem. The means which it proposes to employ, always peaceful, will be directed toward the creation of a condition in which every competent factor of national life will actively participate in the government of the country and in the defense of justice, without recourse to armed action.

To this end the civil union will conduct a campaign of social education through the columns of the press, by holding public meetings, distributing literature, cooperation with the schools, and with every other agency through which its purpose may be accomplished. (La Controversia, September 26, 1926.)

The formation of this new Civil Union for the Defense of Liberty comes as a ray of sunshine and of hope in the confusion to which we have so long been condemned in Mexico.

The campaign to promote civic virtue and civic action will develop public morality and enlighten public opinion, and in the end will render impossible the very existence of laws that are oppressive and unjust, put an end to corruption in public administration, and restore to Mexicans that true liberty which is the fruit of civilization. (Excelsior, September 27, 1926.)

FOREIGN MEDDLERS

A group of Protestants recently visited Mexico. After spending less than a month in the country, they announce that upon their return home they will publish news items in the press, special articles, even books, and that they will lecture on the platform, give interviews, and act as expert advisers concerning the Mexican question. What is even more absurd, the instructors, the women along with the men, who came for the summer school, have promised to make known the truth regarding Mexico, a thing which we ourselves have not yet discovered, and we have grown gray in studying it at close range. * * * The problems of Mexico do not all arise out of oil and land; nor are they all related to the redemption of the Indian. All of these are, of course, serious. But we have problems of race, of language, of climate, of geography, of education, and of a thousand other kinds which are not to be solved by one who has no better preparation than the fact that he has stood with his foot on the rail of some Mexican bar. (Excelsior, September 2, 1926.)

TWO END-OF-YEAR STATEMENTS

The year 1926 has failed to bring the realization of those hopes which, with the suppression of the revolution of De la Huerta, were entertained by everyone truly interested in the rehabilitation and the pacification of our country.

It is not necessary here to pass in review the events which have followed each other or the controversies out of which they sprang. They have all been commented upon in these columns. Why should he now recall the long list of errors, the mistakes, which have filled these 12 months? Every one of them, taken separately as it occurred, has been supported with more or less suffering, but, looking at them all at the same time, we can but wonder that the nation had strength to stand up under such a burden.

The most complicated, as well as the most serious and painful of all these conflicts, is one which strikes at the very life of the nation. It springs from the fact, daily becoming more pronounced, that the Mexican nation is torn by dissension and that new motives for dissension are being daily invented. Not satisfied with the old controversies over politics, out of which sprang hatreds and feuds, daily new fuel is being thrown on the fire and we are faced with a war between classes. As if even that were not enough, to this class war is being added a race war, and we, who should be united because we all enjoy the same civilization, are being forced into irreconcilable antagonisms. Of all the political and economic problems with which we are confronted, serious though they are, none is more to be feared than this. It threatens the nation

with destruction, tearing our national unity into fragments. The year has witnessed a campaign conducted by certain elements in favor of socialism, which, if it is successful, must inevitably end by throwing labor into conflict with that which labor needs most—capital and industrial enterprise. We have been saddened by the injection of the religious question which, long ago, ceased to be a source of disturbance among peoples, finding its solution in liberty, which is tolerance and which respects the rights of others, making it possible for all to live in peace and harmony, regardless of the differences of opinion and ideals. (Excelsior, January 1, 1927.)

The greatest good which we can wish for Mexico during 1927 is that a solution be found for the serious problems with which we are confronted and that this solution be made possible by the loyal cooperation of all the factors of our national life. If that cooperation is to be attained it is, above all, necessary that there be complete peace, tolerance, true and independent patriotism, and above all the suppression of all hatreds between classes and groups. This should be the program for the accomplishment of which we all unite. Peace, prosperity—these are beautiful words, but they will be empty words unless we are all willing to do our part in giving them reality. (El Universal, January 1, 1927.)

A RAY OF HOPE

The program of the revolution, which has been a complete failure in the internal affairs of the country, is now on the point of producing an even worse failure in our international affairs, especially with regard to our relations with the United States. The welfare of a nation is not a thing to be trifled with, and patriotism now demands that there be a radical change in that program. Looking these things in the face, we can but be alarmed when we see our radicals pursue their high-handed course, committing the most serious mistakes, as, for instance, the arming of the agrarians, which is nothing less than the arming of an undisciplined mob which, a sad experience has convinced us, will in the end make evil use of the rifles which should, from the beginning, have been intrusted only to the army.

A program of economy in the public administration of financial and fiscal reorganization, a program of public works executed with energy in the interests of agriculture and commerce is doomed necessarily to failure if it is accompanied with a stubborn determination to hostileize capital, the owners of rural property, and the men of enterprise and labor devoted to the agricultural upbuilding of the country.

The promotion of the interests of labor, the raising of the standard of life is incompatible with the attack that is being made on capital, the source from which the laborer must derive his income.

These and other things we have often repeated. They are axiomatic. They admit of no discussion. Unfortunately, however, vanity is a factor in public life more than is at first apparent, and through vanity men are driven to seek methods which are new and original but which in the end will be found to be extravagant fancies. * * * The first and most important thing for us to do is to clothe ourselves with modesty, with simplicity, with common sense. (Excelsior, January 20, 1927.)

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. As I have only two minutes remaining I would like to read excerpts from two editorials in the American press, in which they tell what they think of the Calles government. The editorials are from two American papers, evidently papers not subsidized or afraid to talk about Mexico. One is from the Washington Post, the other the New York Evening Post. I find that they are rather too long to read in two minutes, but I shall put them in the RECORD.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. I ask that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, after the gentleman from Massachusetts has had his 30 minutes, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is entitled to 15 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not wish to encroach upon the time of the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Nebraska who are going to speak after me. I merely wish to bring these facts before the Congress of the United States and the American people. I am not making a wild statement. I am asking you to look over these facts, which you will find are absolutely true, and obtain the real truth with reference to Mexico.

The Mexican people are suffering under oppression. They have not the rights to which they are entitled, their rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and freedom of conscience, which we have here in the United States. I am asking the consideration of Congress and of the American people to realize the truth of this matter. Find it out for yourselves and then let the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States and the State Department do what they see fit to help Mexico.

We want to help Mexico, but we want to help the people of Mexico and not the rulers of Mexico, who in their zeal are desirous of wiping out all religion—not only the Catholic religion but all religion—and are trying to introduce bolshevism not only into Mexico but into the United States and into the South American Republics. They will never succeed in the United States, but they may succeed in South America, and if they do we shall have plenty on our hands trying to put out the fires of bolshevism which they are lighting in their fanatical zeal to destroy all the ideals for which we stand—love of God, respect for law, freedom of conscience, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, our inalienable rights. [Applause.]

I now quote from two great American newspapers on this subject:

AN AMERICAN OPINION

MEXICO'S LAW ON RELIGION

[Editorial from the Washington Post, August 4, 1926]

The policy adopted by the Mexican Government in dealing with ministers of religion and religious organizations is attracting world-wide attention on account of the novel and drastic details of the law issued by President Calles under date of June 14. While the Catholic Church is most vitally affected, this is merely because the Mexican membership of that church is larger than that of all other denominations combined. All religious organizations, including religious orders, are affected by the law, as well as all ministers of the gospel and all church property.

The law issued by President Calles purports to be in pursuance of the constitution, and in many sections the constitution is clearly obeyed. Other sections, however, seem to be in direct conflict with the constitution of Mexico.

The purpose of the law is stated to be the elimination of religious influence in national political affairs and the complete separation of church and state. If this were the only purpose, and if the law accomplished no more and no less than this, it would command the respect of those who are convinced that church and state must be kept separate in a republic. It confiscates church property, denies the right of the clergy of any denomination to hold services or administer sacraments elsewhere than in churches under governmental scrutiny, denies the liberty of the press, strips all religious persons of distinctive garb, prohibits all religious organizations from acquiring real estate, and confiscates seminaries, colleges, and asylums, as well as churches, bishoprics, parish houses, etc.

The law conforms to the Mexican constitution by requiring that no person not of Mexican birth shall exercise the ministry of any cult.

Rigorous penalties are prescribed for violations of the law and for failure on the part of any official authority to enforce the law.

The right of the Mexican nation to deal with religion as it sees fit can not be questioned by any other nation so long as no other nation's citizens are injured. Any injury to foreigners resulting from the execution of Mexico's new law would be properly the subject of inquiry by the government affected, notwithstanding the declarations that the law is a purely domestic measure.

Without raising the question of President Calles's authority to issue a law which in important particulars seems to transgress the constitution of Mexico it can not be doubted that the Mexican nation is deeply injured by this reactionary and intolerant action. Even if the law were well within the bounds of the constitution, it strikes a blow at religious freedom and freedom of speech and of the press. The fact that the law is enthusiastically approved and supported by the communistic elements of Mexico leads the outside world to suspect that communism has a firm hold upon the Mexican Government and has led it into the folly of imitating the Russian Soviet in attempting to destroy religion. Nothing but disorder, misfortune, and ultimate disaster can come from such a course in a free country in the twentieth century. Mexicans, with all their misgovernment, are free men, having the right of free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, and the power to set up their own government. The destruction of religion and freedom of speech and of the press in Mexico is impossible, and only communists or other madmen would attempt to destroy the rights of a free people.

AMERICAN OPINION FORMING ON MEXICO

[Editorial from New York Evening Post, August 3, 1926]

American opinion is forming itself upon the mighty drama now being played in Mexico. Our people are watching the developments with an interest and an absence of passion that is as rare with us as it is grateful.

It might be taken for granted that American feeling would instinctively sympathize with any effort to bring about that separation between church and state which we have in this country. This is undoubtedly true. Yet our people, we believe, are watching Mexico to make sure whether there is in its governmental program a real effort to make the separation with due regard to freedom of conscience and of religious worship. They are also watching to see whether the church, in defense, may not go too far in its use of both lay and ecclesiastical weapons.

That the issue is not directly the concern of the United States seems to be an opinion generally held by our press. Yet a surprisingly general idea is spreading, despite whatever sympathy there may be with the fundamental idea of Calles's actions, that it appears clear that the church is a stabilizing influence in Mexico, that it is a bar against present bolshevik tendencies, and that without it the country may tend to slip back into a period of re-Indianization. Here there is at least an indirect development that may be of great importance to the United States in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time I have I shall ask my colleagues not to request that I yield until I shall have finished reading part of the convention between the United States and England of May 22, 1924.

This treaty is popularly known as the "12-mile" treaty. At the time it was negotiated the country was informed that a great victory had been obtained by the United States and that the treaty would be of incalculable assistance in the enforcement of the prohibition laws. First, the country was led to believe that the right of search and seizure for liquor was extended 12 miles out at sea. Secondly, when the drys complained of the traffic of liquor on foreign steamships and insisted that the Government take action it placed the United States Government in a most peculiar and difficult situation, so the people of the country were told that satisfactory arrangements had been made with England in this treaty placing liquor under absolute control. The drys were happy, passengers on board foreign steamships, many of them ardent and active drys at home, got all the liquor they want, and everybody was happy. This treaty with England formed the basis for similar arrangements with other countries whose ships are engaged in regular passenger traffic to and from ports of the United States. Now, let us see just what the treaty does. In the first place, the 12-mile idea is little more than fiction. The very first article is a declaration on the part of both contracting parties to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles constitute the proper limits of territorial waters. Then it simply provides that the British Government will raise no objection to a boarding of private vessels under the British flag in order that "inquiries may be addressed to those on board and an examination be made of the ship's papers" for the purpose of ascertaining if the ship's papers contained a list of liquor on board or if the ship's officers will admit having liquor on board. It provides that the ship may be seized if it is caught engaged in violation of any laws of the United States; but that right, I submit, the United States Government always had. But note that the right conferred to board the ship is not 12 miles, as the public was led to believe, but is limited to "no greater distance from the coast than can be traversed in one hour by the vessel suspected," and so forth, or if any other vessel is engaged in conveying the liquor from that vessel to shore the distance is one hour of speed of the vessel conveying from the ship to the shore and not the ship itself. If it is a sail ship, this so-called 12-mile treaty does not extend the distance beyond territorial waters an inch. What is the speed of a vessel? That is a matter of fact which must be determined in each individual case. So that I fail to see where any advantage was obtained by the United States Government in the extension of territorial waters or of its right of search and seizure. On the other hand, the United States surrendered entirely, it seems to me, its right to prevent foreign steamships from having liquor on board while in territorial waters.

If liquor is found on the *Leviathan* or any other American ship—and I say if it is found, or perhaps it would be better to say if the prohibition officials look for it and find it—it constitutes a crime, for such possession being unlawful, and the officers of the ship and the ship itself is liable. In other words, an American ship is not permitted to have liquor on board at any time, but in article 3 of the convention the United States Government specifically and expressly contracted and agreed that—

no penalty or forfeiture under the laws of the United States shall be applicable or attached to alcoholic liquors or to vessels or persons by reason of the carriage of such liquors, when such liquors are listed as sea stores or cargo, etc., provided that such liquor shall be kept under seal.

That sure is one big concession. Why, it makes everybody on board ship immune and legalizes the ship to carry all the liquor it wants. Of course, there is a technical requirement of placing the liquor under seal. There is no provision as to what happens if the liquor is taken, the seal notwithstanding. There is no provision as to how this liquor should be listed or how the list should be verified by United States officials. So

that it would be an extremely difficult thing to convict or even to indict a foreign vessel knowingly bringing liquor into the United States conforming simply with the technical requirements of the treaty and permitting the liquor to be removed after it is here. Why, actual knowledge of the removal would have to be brought home not only to the officers of the ship but to the owners of the ship before the ship could be held liable in the face of the provisions of the treaty. So I do not hesitate to say that if anyone believes that the so-called 12-mile treaties are for the benefit of prohibition enforcement they are surely laboring under a gross misapprehension. It is another instance that shows that the enforcement of prohibition, considering usage and customs in other countries of the world, the commercial relations which we as a Nation must maintain with other nations, the traffic which must necessarily exist between this country and other countries, is simply impossible.

With permission of the House, I shall insert the whole of the treaty at the conclusion of my remarks, and if time will permit I will revert to it.

Now, I want to inform the House, as I have informed the Secretary of the Treasury to-day, of the existence of a bootleg syndicate in New York City and, as I am informed, at other ports of the United States, whereby the socially select can receive all the pure and good liquor they want as long as they have the price, the liquor coming direct from Europe on foreign ships. The syndicate operates in this way:

The first list of customers was obtained from the first-class passenger lists on the big steamers. During the summer travel contact is established, trade created, and during the fall and winter business in liquor flourishes. The list is naturally growing. They now know that on the arrival of any of the big steamers a fresh supply of aged and pure liquor is available. The syndicate employs a traffic manager, who receives orders and directs deliveries. This manager has his office down at 32 Broadway. His room number—well, perhaps I had better not give you that—but if the department takes the two winning points of America's favorite indoor sport, commonly known as "galloping dominoes," there will be little difficulty in finding it. The manager receives a salary, it is stated, of \$12,500 a year.

How is the liquor gotten out? I will tell you. When a ship arrives at port, as you know, the baggage is inspected, and after it passes the customs inspector a customs stamp is put on the baggage. This [indicating] is one of the stamps. After the baggage leaves the pier and clears the customs line these stamps are surreptitiously taken from the baggage. The market price of these stamps now is one bottle of whisky for three used stamps.

I want to make it clear that I am convinced the customs inspectors are in no way involved in this. The stamps are taken off the baggage after the baggage leaves the pier and is out of the jurisdiction of the custom inspectors. I do believe that the collector of customs in New York has not been sufficiently diligent and, surely, far from alert. These stamps are given to the men on the ships in charge of the liquor. Then empty trunks are sent on the pier. The orders are filled and these stamps are placed on the trunks, which gives them clearance and delivered to the customer. Here [exhibiting] are some of the original orders for the liquor. So painstaking are these patrons in giving the order that with the order a diagram of the route showing exact location of place of delivery is often given with the order, so that there can be no mistake as to the delivery. I show you here [exhibiting] several such diagrams.

Here [exhibiting] is a large photographic copy of the diagram. Here is the original order from which the photo was made of an order from the executive office of a very large business. You would all know the name if I told you. Here is the order [exhibiting] and here is the diagram of place of delivery of another customer located in Westchester County of my State. Only a few days ago a certain gentleman assumed a hypocritical attitude in making a speech on prohibition and law enforcement before the Seamen's Institute, and I find him among the ready customers of this bootleg syndicate. Six thousand dollars' worth of liquor was delivered in one office in the Gray-Bar Building. A very fashionable store on Fifth Avenue in the thrifty thirties, dealing with women's apparel, receives orders openly, the liquor coming from this source. Here is a gentleman engaged in the insurance business in Philadelphia and New York who puts in an order for several cases of liquor.

MR. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

MR. LA GUARDIA. In a moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Here [exhibiting] is another order coming to Pelham, with a careful diagram of the locations. Here is a lady on Fifth Avenue; I have her order here [exhibiting].

This lady is prominent socially, sure has a versatile drinking taste, and her home will at least be well furnished for a cheerful Yuletide. Let me read her order, and I am reading from the original:

Six cases of Bollinger, 1919; 6 cases Old Tom gin; 6 cases Scotch; 2 cases French Vermouth; 1 case Italian Vermouth; 1 case Cointreau and Chartreuse; 1 case Liqueur brandy.

This little woman knows her liquor. It has been suggested to me that I give a typical order of a prominent business man. That is easy to do. I have quite an assortment here. Here is one, on the pad of a very prominent business man, and the pad bears the dignified caption, "Executive offices" [exhibiting]. Every New York Member would know this man, and I am sure a great many of the eastern Members know him by name. Here is his recent order from one of the large ships:

Five cases champagne, Paul Roger, 1917—

Apparently particular in the choice of his vintage—

5 cases whisky, Haig & Haig; 5 cases Gordon gin; 3 cases M. & R. Vermouth; 3 cases French Vermouth; 1 case Cointreau; 1 Chartreuse, yellow; 1 Martel brandy.

That ends his order. Here is an order [exhibiting] from a hotel supply company. They use their own letterhead, but this firm seems to go in for Rhine wine, champagne, and not so strong on the whisky.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? If the gentleman gets all this evidence, what is the reason why the prohibition enforcement officers could not get it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can not answer why any official can not or will not get information that everyone else knows. The gentleman knows that every statement I made in this House in the last three or four years on flagrant violations of law has been substantiated. I gave the facts in the Ohio case, in the Indianapolis case; in the New York prohibition office I gave the facts straight in the Government-operation cases.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am not questioning the accuracy of the evidence.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have recommended to the Secretary of the Treasury, gentlemen, that it is simply ridiculous to have a stamp like this [exhibiting] on baggage, and I recommended in my letter a different colored stamp for each pier and each day, and the particular stamp not to be known until the baggage is ready for delivery, the baggage which remains overnight to be inspected anew.

I am pointing this out, gentlemen, in the course of the attitude I have assumed in attempting to convince you gentlemen who believe the prohibition law is being enforced that it is not being enforced and that it is humanly impossible to enforce it.

These are not exceptional cases. I would have had several hundreds of these orders but my informant weakened. He believed he might be identified through particular orders and he feared for his life. I can assure you the facts are just as I have stated and we have photographs of trunks that are used over and over again, besides original orders. It is an organized business.

On the door of this traffic manager's office appears the name of a reputable director of scenarios, who knows nothing about this and is out somewhere making pictures. Certainly the department can run this system down and put an end to it. I will give the Secretary of the Treasury all the information I have.

Now, let us get back to the treaty.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman give the names?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. Of the sellers.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is the gentleman willing to give the names of the consumers, the purchasers?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; it is no crime to buy.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Well, it ought to be.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can not help that. This is what you have done in your treaty of May 22, 1924, in order to obtain the privilege of boarding a vessel 12 miles out, which you do not do. You have provided in Article III that—

No penalty or forfeiture under the laws of the United States shall be applicable or attach to alcoholic liquors or to vessels or persons by reason of the carriage of such liquors.

All they have to do is to constructively place liquor under seal, which means absolutely nothing.

The liquor I am talking about comes from such well-known ships as the *Majestic*, *Olympia*, *Homer*, *Aquitania*, *Berengaria*,

Mauretania, *Ile de France*, *Paris*, *Conte Brancamano*, *Conte Rosso*, *Duilio*, and others.

There are your facts. Now, gentlemen, is it fair to the people in New York who are being poisoned by the stuff that is being sold, and if one of my constituents has a pint in his possession he is haled to court and is put on trial while those who are mighty and favored have this means of having distributed to them large quantities of their favorite brands and choice vintages?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for just one more brief question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think it is his duty as a citizen and as a Member of Congress to put the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice in possession of all these facts?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have already done so, and in my time I will ask the Clerk to read this letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1927.

Hon. ANDREW W. MELLON,

Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have learned of a system of liquor importation prevalent in all large ports which I believe can be stopped by administrative measures and not requiring any special legislation. It is just another instance illustrating the hopelessness of ever enforcing the prohibition law. Nevertheless, until the law is changed, action should be taken to prevent the continuance of the disgraceful conditions now in vogue.

Customs stamps placed on passengers' baggage after due inspection and for the purpose of passing the custom guard on the piers are removed from the baggage after it leaves the jurisdiction of the custom officials and then sold to a bootleg syndicate operating from the big passenger ships. One bottle of whisky for three used custom stamps is the last market price. I want to make it clear that these stamps are taken from the passengers' baggage after it leaves the piers, and I am certain that custom officials are in no way involved in these illegal transactions. I believe, however, that the collector of customs at New York has not been sufficiently diligent and far from alert.

Patrons desiring liquor of imported brands send their orders either through a representative of the syndicate, who operates from an office in lower Manhattan, or direct to the ship. Old trunks are brought on the pier and filled with liquor. These trunks are used over and over again. The purloined stamps are applied to the trunks and thereby get clearance from the piers. I have before me several original orders for liquor and have some custom stamps which were so used. I would have had possession of a great amount of original orders, but my informant weakened, as he was in fear of his life if his identity were established through the original orders to which he had access.

The liquor is brought here by large, first-class de luxe, passenger ships engaged in trans-Atlantic service.

I make the following suggestions:

Immediate change of customs stamps; the use of different colored stamps for each day and each pier, the color not to be known until all baggage is ready for clearance from the dock; also baggage remaining overnight or leaving the pier another day should be again inspected. Strips should be pasted across the openings of the trunks or baggage and escorted to the pier exit by custom guards.

I submit these suggestions, based on my information of what is going on in New York and other ports, and feel that as long as this impossible law is on the statute books and the poor people of my city are being poisoned or haled to court for the possession of a pint, this source of special vintages for the mighty and favored should be stopped without further delay.

Yours very truly,

F. LAGUARDIA.

[Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The treaty referred to in my remarks is as follows:

Convention between the United States and Great Britain for prevention of smuggling of intoxicating liquors. Signed at Washington, January 23, 1924; ratification advised by the Senate, March 13, 1924; ratified by the President, March 21, 1924; ratified by Great Britain, April 30, 1924; ratifications exchanged at Washington, May 22, 1924; proclaimed, May 22, 1924.

By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas a convention between the United States of America and Great Britain to aid in the prevention of the smuggling of intoxicating liquors into the United States was concluded and signed by their respective plenipotentiaries at Washington on the 23d day of January, 1924, the original of which convention is word for word as follows:

The President of the United States of America;

And His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India;

Being desirous of avoiding any difficulties which might arise between them in connection with the laws in force in the United States on the subject of alcoholic beverages;

Have decided to conclude a convention for that purpose;

And have appointed as their plenipotentiaries

The President of the United States of America;

Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States;

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India;

The Right Hon. Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, G. C. M. G., K. C. B., his ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States of America;

Who having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles extending from the coastline outwards and measured from low-water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters.

ARTICLE II

(1) His Britannic Majesty agrees that he will raise no objection to the boarding of private vessels under the British flag outside the limits of territorial waters by the authorities of the United States, its Territories or possessions, in order that enquiries may be addressed to those on board and an examination be made of the ship's papers for the purpose of ascertaining whether the vessel or those on board are endeavoring to import or have imported alcoholic beverages into the United States, its Territories or possessions, in violation of the laws there in force. When such enquiries and examination show a reasonable ground for suspicion a search of the vessel may be instituted.

(2) If there is reasonable cause for belief that the vessel has committed or is committing or attempting to commit an offense against the laws of the United States, its Territories or possessions, prohibiting the importation of alcoholic beverages, the vessel may be seized and taken into a port of the United States, its Territories or possessions, for adjudication in accordance with such laws.

(3) The rights conferred by this article shall not be exercised at a greater distance from the coast of the United States, its Territories or possessions, than can be traversed in one hour by the vessel suspected of endeavoring to commit the offense. In cases, however, in which the liquor is intended to be conveyed to the United States, its Territories or possessions, by a vessel other than the one boarded and searched, it shall be the speed of such other vessel and not the speed of the vessel boarded which shall determine the distance from the coast at which the right under this article can be exercised.

ARTICLE III

No penalty or forfeiture under the laws of the United States shall be applicable or attach to alcoholic liquors or to vessels or persons by reason of the carriage of such liquors when such liquors are listed as sea stores or cargo destined for a port foreign to the United States, its Territories or possessions, on board British vessels voyaging to or from ports of the United States, or its Territories or possessions, or passing through the territorial waters thereof, and such carriage shall be as now provided by law with respect to the transit of such liquors through the Panama Canal, provided that such liquors shall be kept under seal continuously while the vessel on which they are carried remains within said territorial waters, and that no part of such liquors shall at any time or place be unladen within the United States, its Territories or possessions.

ARTICLE IV

Any claim by a British vessel for compensation on the grounds that it has suffered loss or injury through the improper or unreasonable exercise of the rights considered by Article II of this treaty, or on the ground that it has not been given the benefit of Article III, shall be referred for the joint consideration of two persons, one of whom shall be nominated by each of the high contracting parties.

Effect shall be given to the recommendations contained in any such joint report. If no joint report can be agreed upon, the claim shall be referred to the claims commission established under the provisions of the agreement for the settlement of outstanding pecuniary claims, signed at Washington, August 18, 1910, but the claim shall not, before submission to the tribunal, required to be included in a schedule of claims confirmed in the manner therein provided.

ARTICLE V

This treaty shall be subject to ratification and shall remain in force for a period of one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications.

Three months before the expiration of the said period of one year either of the high contracting parties may give notice of its desire to propose modifications in the terms of the treaty.

If such modifications have not been agreed upon before the expiration of the term of one year mentioned above, the treaty shall lapse.

If no notice is given on either side of the desire to propose modifications, the treaty shall remain in force for another year, and so on automatically, but subject always in respect of each such period of a year to the right on either side to propose as provided above three months before its expiration modifications in the treaty, and to the provision that if such modifications are not agreed upon before the close of the period of one year, the treaty shall lapse.

ARTICLE VI

In the event that either of the high contracting parties shall be prevented either by judicial decision or legislative action from giving full effect to the provisions of the present treaty the said treaty shall automatically lapse, and on such lapse, or whenever this treaty shall cease to be in force, each high contracting party shall enjoy all the rights which it would have possessed had this treaty not been concluded.

The present convention shall be duly ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Britannic Majesty, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present convention in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at the city of Washington this 23d day of January, A. D. 1924.

[SEAL.]

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES.

[SEAL.]

A. C. GEDDES.

And whereas the said convention has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratifications of the two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington on the 22d day of May, 1924;

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America, have caused the said convention to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 22d day of May, A. D. 1924, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-eighth.

[SEAL.]

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

By the President:

CHARLES E. HUGHES,

Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I do not come to carry to the House this morning an argument in behalf of any great governmental problem. I come rather to speak for a moment with reference to the soul of sentiment, if you please—a sentiment which it seems to me must animate every American citizen.

A sage once said that the best protection a republican form of government could possibly have is a satisfied soldiery. I think this House has been doing fairly well in trying to prove its loyalty to the expression of that sage, but I ask it to take one step more in that good direction.

I come this morning to offer to my friends not an oratorical effort. You were told by our Speaker, who is always kind, that somebody would come to-day and bring down the oratorical stars and juggle them before you. But that is not for me. I come to you simply to call your attention to a modest little bill which has been introduced here—a bill to provide a plan for the holding in this Capital City next year of a joint reunion of the survivors of the armies of the blue and of the gray.

I do not know what better service in my capacity as a Member of this Congress I might render to my people and to my country generally than the service of doing my part in every way possible to obliterate the last remnant of ill feeling between the sections of the North and the sections of the South as we once knew them. [Applause.] Some might ask who inspired me to introduce this bill, which I now refer to as House bill No. 5577. Well, my inspiration might be said to have come directly from a wonderful veteran of the Civil War who lives in my own country, Hon. Lucius D. Richards, of Fremont, Nebr., aided and abetted by his able coadjutor, Judge Morley Cain, a prince of the house of Humanity. Those two, I presume, more than any others, are responsible for the inspiration. I feel I have a perfect right to propose this legislation because of the fact that I am about as far removed from sectional feeling with reference to that great struggle as any man might be. I recall, by recitation of my elders, that in the days of the strife about one-third of the men of the blood of my kinsmen were in the Union Army, about one-third in the Confederate Army, and about one-third (being Quakers) were

ministering to the sick and wounded on both sides. So I feel fully authorized to bear to the attention of the House a proposition of this kind.

Mr. JONES. May I interrupt the gentleman to ask a question?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Can the gentleman give us any estimate of how many are left among the old soldiers on either side?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Oh, yes; I can give you an estimate, and not only an estimate, I can give you the facts; and in the presentation of a case of this kind I want to deal with fact as well as with sentiment.

According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, who has better knowledge on this score, perhaps, than any other, I am informed that on the last day of November of this year there were still living 84,478 men who served in the Union Army. Now, I take it for granted that approximately the same number survive with reference to the Confederate side. How many would be able to attend such a reunion? I have talked with many of the old soldiers on both sides, and the general estimate is that the number would be less than 10,000. How do I gather that, or, rather, how do they reach that estimate? They reach it by taking the figures of the Pension Commissioner, which show that in round numbers 50,000 of the 80,000 living Union soldiers are now physically incapacitated, requiring the constant aid and attention of some other person to care for them because of infirmity; and of the remainder, the estimate is made by those who have taken account of the attendance at the annual reunions of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the United Confederate Veterans.

Oh, my friends, it is not so much the number; it is not so much the cost that this will be, for, indeed, while I am an extreme economist, as you all know, with reference to a sentiment of this kind the subject of cost does not come into or under my own consideration.

Out here this morning on the steps of the Capitol we witnessed the return of some captured Confederate flags by the people of the Northern State of Maine to the people of North Carolina. Those people up there in Maine, whom the southerners used to call the cold-blooded Yankees, are now warm, and they come down here bearing their captured flags to the North Carolinians, and I understand that if North Carolina did capture flags from the Maine regiments she has already or is to return them to the State of Maine.

I recall an incident a little while ago when the State of New Jersey, through its governor, returned some Confederate flags to a Southern State—I think it was North Carolina also—and here I have a little editorial from the New York Times, which says of that action:

The decision of the Governor of New Jersey to return to North Carolina flags of that State captured by New Jersey regiments during the Civil War will be approved in the North as well as in the South. Ever since the World War brought the sons of northern and southern veterans into close contact, the last remaining vestige of regional feeling has disappeared. The North has taken Lee to heart as a great American. The South has recognized the splendor of Lincoln. As one mark of the new spirit, many Confederate flags taken by northern troops and Union flags taken by the southerners have been returned. In following this custom New Jersey is contributing her share to the obliteration of unpleasant memories.

My friends, I would have you understand that my greatest thought, my greatest desire in presenting this little bill for this proposed reunion is that I may play a small part in obliterating those unhappy memories.

Now, the bill is very simple. It provides that there shall be a commission appointed, consisting of the General of the United States Army, the governors of the several States, and such persons as the President of the United States may be pleased to appoint, to have general charge of the reunion.

Some might say that a commission comprising all of the governors of the States would be unwieldy and that the governors could not come to Washington to meet very frequently; but you all know that here in the city of Washington is domiciled a splendid citizen from every State in the Union, many of them, and it would always be easy for the governor to appoint a proxy from his own State. I do not think this would be objectionable. I do not think of any better plea that I might leave with you, my friends, as a last remark on this subject, than to quote some of the utterances by the splendid ones who have represented us in high capacity in our Government in peace and in war.

I recall—it may have been at Appomattox, I do not know, but certainly soon thereafter—when the great General Grant uttered that immortal expression, "Let us have peace." It

was only a little while after that that the wonderful Lee said, "We are all one now." It was not long after when dear, old General Gordon said, "The American people will forever remain an unbroken brotherhood from sea to sea"; and it was not long after when the princely McKinley said, "Let us strew flowers alike on the graves of those who wore the Blue and those who wore the Gray, for American valor is the common heritage of the Nation."

Living here in Washington to-day is a wonderful old soldier of the Confederacy. Ah, he knew what service was and he knew what suffering was. He was in the war for four and a half years, and the last part of it he spent in prison. His heart is so full of a desire to accomplish a final wiping away of all thought of bitterness between the two peoples that he has written a poem which has been set to music under the caption "The blend of the blue and the gray." I refer to Maj. John Alleine Brown, of Washington City. I know that many of you are personally acquainted with him, and I would like to leave as my closing plea in behalf of the proposed joint reunion the inspiring lines by Major Brown:

THE BLEND OF THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

By J. Alleine Brown

Oh, swell the song of kindred fame,
And blow, ye bugles, blow;
Nor more doth burn with heated flame
The passion of the foe:
The battle long hath ceased to rage,
There is no battle line.
The Nation's pride engraves the page,
Its joy invests the shrine.

The blend of blue lights up the gray,
The blend of gray the blue;
Together now those colors sway
With inspiration new.
'Tis patriot hands that sweep the lyre;
They chant on high their lay;
The blue invokes the Nation's choir,
"My country," sings the gray.

Then chant the blended blue and gray,
Tho' once they faced each other;
Those tattered ensigns furled away
Proclaim the name of brother.
We've found at last the vaulted sky
For us o'erspread away;
Eternally the blue on high
Blends with the morning gray.

[Applause.]

THE ALIEN PROPERTY BILL

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, commonly known as the alien property bill.

Pending that motion I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] if we can agree on time for general debate?

Mr. COLLIER. Does the gentleman from Iowa want general debate confined to the bill? I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think it will be necessary, and I will not ask for it.

Mr. COLLIER. An agreement was practically made yesterday that the general debate would go on to-day and be concluded to-day with an additional hour when we took up the bill again on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the general debate on this side can be concluded to-day, and I will ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he can not get along with less than an hour on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] informs me that he can get along with 40 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, perhaps we better make it an hour, for I may want to make a few observations myself.

Mr. COLLIER. I have one or two other Members who say they want a little time on Monday, but I know that was not in the request that I made yesterday. Does not the gentleman think we can conclude the bill on the first legislative day?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not; because there are some other matters that will come on before it.

Mr. TILSON. Can not the other gentlemen that the gentleman from Mississippi speaks of go on to-day? There will be plenty of time to-day for all who wish to speak, with the exception of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLIER. I think the hour will be sufficient unless the gentleman from Iowa wants to take up too much of the extra 20 minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Let the gentleman from Mississippi ask for an hour and 20 minutes on Monday or Tuesday; he need not use all of it.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; I will ask for an hour and 20 minutes, providing 1 hour of that time is given to me.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue during this day and not to exceed 1 hour and 20 minutes on the next day that the discussion of the bill is resumed; that the time to-day be controlled one half by the gentleman from Mississippi and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate shall continue to-day until the House adjourns, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], and not to exceed 1 hour and 20 minutes on the next day on which the bill is taken up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. GREEN of Iowa was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, before making any remarks on the bill, if any gentleman on this side of the aisle wants time in general debate I would like to have him make known his wishes to-day.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which is now presented to the House is in all its essential features the same as the one passed by an overwhelming majority in the House at the last session. There is no change whatever in its principles, in its policies, its ratio of payment, or in any particular except to make some improvements in its wording and on some comparatively unessential matters to make provision for certain things that were overlooked in the former bill.

Mr. Chairman, the aftermath of a great war always brings problems, and none of the problems that have been presented by reason of the conclusion of that war have been so perplexing as those arising out of the seizure of German property and the claims of American citizens against the German Government.

Whenever a solution has been sought it has been found that the discussion involves not only international law but also international policies of the Government from the very day it first came into existence. It must take into consideration the treaties of Versailles and of Berlin, which fixed the terms upon which peace was restored. It must examine negotiations and agreements between our diplomatic representatives and those of other countries. In short, it includes a study of the policies, treaties, and agreements in order to determine the proper basis of settlement; but even when all this is done, there remains one matter which has contributed more than anything else to the difficulties of settlement, and that is that Germany is not in any position to make immediate payment of the claims which may be established against her and which she rightfully ought to pay. If this was out of the way the solution would be comparatively easy.

Out of this tangled web of international policies, of treaties, of diplomatic negotiations, claims against our Government on the one hand and against the German Government on the other, threads can be picked out here and there upon which fine-spun and plausible arguments can be and have been constructed in favor of various theories, none of which, when considered by itself alone, leads to a solution of the problem. So difficult was this solution that four years passed after the war before anybody even ventured to make the suggestion as to how it ought to be solved. I do not think that any committee ever worked harder than the Ways and Means Committee did over the various bills that were submitted to it. It struggled for more than two months to no avail. The complications were such and the claims of the various parties so conflicting that there seemed to be no way of reconciling them, and no possible way out of the difficulty. Various plans were proposed and several submitted in the form of bills. I shall not discuss the propositions. Those who were Members of the House at a previous session are more or less familiar with them. I shall only say that so much opposition developed to all of them that none gave rise to any reasonable expectation that any of them could be passed by Congress, and upon none of them was the committee in complete accord.

Nothing was done, and the whole matter went over to another session of the committee held a year ago last fall in advance of the session of Congress. In the meantime the demands of the claimants became more urgent and more pressing. Many of the claimants were experiencing severe financial stress by reason of this long and, as it appears to them, unwarranted delay.

After having had all of these hearings—and we had three separate sets of hearings—and after all our proceedings so far had come to naught, I said in the presence of the representatives of the various claimants that if this matter continued in the present form very much longer the chances would be that nothing would ever be done for any of the claimants on either side, and that the claims in this case might eventually be carried along and carried along until their fate was similar to that of the French spoliation claims—perfectly good—but those claims have been before Congress for more than a hundred years and nothing has ever been done with them. I said to the respective parties at that time that unless each party was willing to make some concession, come to some form of compromise about this matter, that we never would be able to get anywhere, and that it was imperatively necessary that they do so if they ever expected to realize upon their claims. Very much to my surprise, when I made this statement the claimants manifested a great deal of interest in the situation in the way of meeting and seeking out some sort of compromise in the matter. I made a suggestion to them at the time that instead of each claimant demanding that his claim be paid in full at once that each claimant concede that he should get only a part of his claim now and the rest of it later, but that all on both sides should eventually be paid and satisfied according to some just and fair rule; and I told them that if they were willing to do that it was probable that the committee could reach a solution of the problems that were before it. So the representatives of the German claimants and the representatives of the American claimants finally got together, and they agreed on this plan which is stated in the bill. I do not present it as an ideal solution of the problems which were presented to the committee. I do not say that in all respects it is fair and just in the abstract. I say that it is the best practical solution that could be worked out under the circumstances, and one which is so nearly just and so nearly fair that the parties on both sides are willing and desirous, I might say eager and anxious, to have it accepted.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is it provided under the bill that enough German property shall be retained in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian to insure the payment of claims that Americans hold against Germany for property destroyed by that country during the war and before we went into the war?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is provision made for that, though not entirely out of the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, but in other ways, as the gentleman will see as I proceed.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is not seeking to exercise the powers reserved to the Government under the Berlin treaty; that is, the holding of alien-enemy property as security for the payment of claims?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; and if the gentleman will read the report he will see that.

Mr. COX. I read the report, but I did not put that construction upon it. In part, the idea may be involved in the solution the gentleman offers, but I do not see that it is fully carried out.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is what I am interested in—whether you retain enough to insure the payment of our claims against the German Government for property of Americans that was destroyed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Let me go a little further with my statement, and I think, if the gentleman pleases, I will answer these questions. At the previous session of Congress there were many propositions for the disposition and settlement of these claims. The first involved a virtual confiscation of the German property which was in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian and its application to the payment of American claims. This plan, I think, met with so little support in Congress that it hardly needs be discussed at this time. I am quite sure that a great majority of the House were against the confiscation of private property seized in time of war, and believe that such property should ultimately be returned.

Mr. COX. What definition does the gentleman give to the term "confiscation"?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will let me proceed I will be obliged.

The other plan required a large appropriation, not only to pay what the Government might owe for the ships, radio stations, and patents to which I have referred, but also to pay the American claimants. There was one other plan, I believe, which contemplated taking that portion of the reparation funds which was to be paid on account of our army of occupation, and applying it on the American claims. These plans were carefully considered by the committee. So much objection was made to making an appropriation on behalf of the Government to pay claims of individuals, or even to the use of the funds that were to be paid on account of our army of occupation, that no action was taken on the bills which carried these plans, and the whole matter, as I have said, went over until this session.

The lack of funds to pay the American claims required some new plan to be devised. Germany was a bankrupt nation. Whatever it could pay was being seized by the Allies. The committee also considered that any plan which would be acceptable to the House and to the Congress must provide for four matters which are stated in the report.

First. The settlement of the claims of the United States and its nationals against Germany and its nationals;

Second. The settlement of the claims of Germany and its nationals against the United States.

Third. The return of the property held by the Alien Property Custodian which was seized during the war as the private property of citizens of the countries with which we were at war.

Fourth—and I think this a very important and essential feature of the bill. The temporary retention of sufficient German property to reasonably insure the payment of American claims and a return of the property which is properly held as fast as American claims are paid.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield there? What does the gentleman mean by "temporary retention of a part of the alien property"? In the statement of policy you promise ultimately to return it. In this same statement of policy you undertake to have the Government guarantee the ultimate payment of claims of our nationals.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman please make his speech in his own time?

Mr. COX. If the gentleman does not desire to yield to a question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know how I could make it any more plain. The expression "temporary retention" means we will retain it for a time and eventually turn it over.

Mr. COX. But the gentleman certainly does not object to informing the House what he means by "temporary retention"?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I say, holding the property for a time until the American claims are paid, and gradually, as they are paid, we will release the property.

Mr. COX. This is the question, if the gentleman will yield: Do you condition the promise made by the bill for the ultimate payment of the German nationals upon the German Government fulfilling its obligations under the Dawes plan?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. The gentleman will have plenty of time to make his argument.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With pleasure.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the question of the gentleman from Georgia is more pertinent than the gentleman thinks it is. I had something to do with alien property matters in the beginning. The gentleman from Georgia is trying to differentiate—and very properly—the indefinite holding of property and confiscation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought I made it plain.

Mr. RAYBURN. What the gentleman means by this temporary business is possibly the very principle which underlies this bill.

Mr. COLLIER. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, I think, with all deference to both of my colleagues the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas, it strikes me they have got the matter confused between a long-delayed payment and confiscation. This is simply a long-delayed payment. There is nothing indefinite. Any man can take a pencil and by figuring obtain the very last year of payment.

Mr. COX. Not at all. The point I am trying to develop, and which is supported by the admission of the gentleman having the floor, is that this bill means confiscation of alien private property. What if the German Government fails to keep its engagement under the Dawes plan with this Government acting not only in behalf of both itself and its nationals? That is the point I want to see developed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is open to my friend to make his argument later on. If the gentleman will examine the bill, he will find it does not provide for anything of the kind. I hope

the gentleman will not state that I admit matters which I expressly deny.

The committee also considered it to be essential to any of the plans to be considered to make no discrimination for or against the German payments on the one hand or the American payments on the other. I think I can state the essential features of the plan in a few words.

Under this plan the German and the American claimants are each and all to receive the greater part of their claims when the proposed law goes into full effect and operation, and the remainder is to be deferred and paid out of the 2¼ per cent of the Dawes reparation fund.

It will be observed that there were three existing items requiring funds for payment.

First. The German claims for property seized by the Alien Property Custodian. The funds for the payment of the undervalued part of these claims were available in the hands of the custodian himself, and under the control of this Government.

Second. The payment of the part not deferred of the German claims for ships or radio stations, and so forth, taken over by the American Government. For the payment of these claims an appropriation must be made, it being generally conceded that our Government was liable therefor and ought to settle these claims. I am aware that that is a matter as to which there may be some discussion. I am speaking now only in general terms, but I will say this in this connection, that in negotiations had between the diplomatic representatives of our Government and those of England it was conceded that if we finally appropriate any of these ships or confiscate the radio stations or the patents, the value thereof should be taken out of our share of the reparation payments. In other words, we must pay for them one way or the other, and I am quite clear that it is better that we pay under a plan whereby we determine the measure of their value.

You will find a full report of that in Senate Document No. 173, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, which contains the correspondence of our Secretary of State with the representative of the English Government with reference to the reparation claims.

Now, as I said, this bill is not an ideal solution of the question. If it were possible to do so, the best way would be to pay all these claims in full on both sides, but there is no way in which that can be done. We worked faithfully and long upon the bill.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. I understand this is practically the same bill that was passed at the last session?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; with some slight differences.

Mr. ARNOLD. Can the gentleman state briefly what the differences are?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can take them and point them out to the gentleman, outside of verbal changes.

Mr. COX. There are a number of changes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Only a few outside of purely verbal changes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I think if the gentleman from Iowa can state specifically in his remarks in the Record just what the changes are it will be helpful, so that anyone can readily ascertain the facts. It will be helpful to the entire membership of the House if it appears in the Record. Please state just what the changes are in the bill from the bill of last Congress.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is a change on page 3, lines 19 and 20. That is a technical, clarifying change. It provides that "The amount so deducted shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. HUDSPETH. What did the old bill provide?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It left it to implication.

There is a change also on page 12, lines 6 and 7, which is merely a verbal change. It does not alter the effect of the bill.

There is also a change on page 20, subsection (d), a rewording, carrying out the purpose of the former law. Subsection (d) is rewritten in a more simple form. It provides now that—

Fifty per cent of the amounts appropriated under the authority of section 4 shall be available for payments under paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (c) of this section, and shall be available only for such payments until such time as the payments authorized by such paragraphs have been completed.

Then on page 21 there is a new subsection (g) added, which the committee deemed necessary to prevent any possibility of double payment. Subsection (g) provides:

That there shall be deducted from the amounts first payable under this section to any American national in respect of any debt, the

amount, if any, paid by the Alien Property Custodian in respect of such debt which was not credited by the Mixed Claims Commission in making its award.

Now, the reason for this paragraph is that the American nationals who had claims against any German who had property with the Alien Property Custodian could file his claim with the Alien Property Custodian and might get his claim allowed against this property. He could also proceed before the Mixed Claims Commission and get it allowed there. This resulted in a situation where it was possible to get a double allowance, and the purpose of subsection (g) is simply to prevent any party from getting a double payment.

Now, there is a change on page 24, line 13. The matter inclosed in parenthesis is added to make it certain that the rights of American creditors against property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian will not be interfered with in the retention of property of the German Government. This is in harmony with the new subsection (p), on page 34 of the bill.

On page 26, paragraph (e) has been added to make it certain that future payments from the fund to the Alien Property Custodian will be distributed pro rata to the German owners of the property.

On page 32 there is a change in the wording in the parenthesis in lines 6 and 7, where we have provided that the valuation by the Alien Property Custodian, in preparing for the return of the property, should be made "at the time, as near as may be, of the return."

There is also a sentence added on lines 19 and 20 and 21 in the wording, in harmony with the provision on page 24, line 13, heretofore explained.

On page 34 there is a new paragraph, subsection (p), which is inserted to take care of a situation not covered by the previous bill.

Then, in lines 24 and 25, at the bottom of page 34 and at the top of page 35, the wording has been changed somewhat in order to clarify the provision. It reads now:

The Alien Property Custodian shall allocate among the various trusts the funds in the "unallocated interest fund (as defined in section 28). Such allocation shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be based upon the average rate of earnings (determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) on the total amounts deposited under section 12."

Subsection (b), on page 35, has also been rewritten, because the payment of interest out of the unallocated interest fund is now well cared for by court decisions and opinions of the Attorney General not in existence at the time the bill was under consideration last Congress.

On page 36, section 28 has been rewritten, but there is no substantial change in policy.

Section 29 is new, for the purpose of carrying out further the purposes of the act.

There was some objection made to the original bill reported by the committee last year by the Alien Property Custodian in that it prevented him from seizing further property when under the law it ought to be seized and should be taken. Also, there was an objection made that if the law stood as we had it in the original bill he would have to take the whole property seized, if he enforced the outstanding demands, when the bill provided for the return of 80 per cent.

Mr. COX. Are we to understand that the Alien Property Custodian is to exercise war power in these times of peace by the further seizure of alien property?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no question but what all Germans ought to be treated in the same kind of way, as far as that is concerned. All of section 29 is new, to prevent the harsh enforcement of demands made during the war.

Section 14, on page 38, is also new. It deals with the return of income, and provides for unlimited return of income accruing after the bill becomes law, and considers all income prior thereto the same as other property held by the custodian.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. What is the total amount found by the Mixed Claims Commission to be due to American claimants, approximately?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The awards, with interest, as stated in the report, amount to \$186,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. How much of this German property will be retained to insure the payments provided under the bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Twenty per cent of it will be retained.

Mr. COX. It will be more than that when you add unallocated interest.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; with the unallocated interest it will be more.

Mr. COX. That is a part of the principal, of course.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is a part of the German property, as I view it.

Mr. COX. There will be about 40 per cent, will there not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, it may be very nearly that; I am not sure.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HOOPER. Has the Mixed Claims Commission entirely completed its work of adjudicating these claims?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They have practically completed their work.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman tell us what is the proportion of German claims against Americans and American claims against Germans?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The property of Germans in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, as stated in the report, amounts to \$264,000,000, including the Austrian and Hungarian property, which, however, is not covered by this bill. Of German property alone it amounts to \$245,000,000.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Then do we understand that only 20 per cent of that amount is to be retained to pay the \$186,000,000 worth of claims?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; but that 20 per cent is not the only amount to be available. A large part of the American claims will be paid at once.

Mr. COX. The bill also provides for the retention of other moneys making, as I recall from a reading of the report, about 40 per cent?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It may be pretty nearly 40 per cent of the German property. Then there is also provision made for the use of the 2¼ per cent that is paid under the Dawes reparations.

Mr. HUDSON. Just in a word or two, how much of this \$186,000,000 worth of claims of American citizens will the taxpayers of America have to pay?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not anything, except claims for the German ships, patents, and radio stations.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Which went to the Government?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That went to the Government. It is a debt of the National Government.

Mr. COX. But only 50 per cent of that is being appropriated.

Mr. HUDSON. A debt of the National Government to our claimants?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; it is a debt of the National Government to the German nationals whose property was seized.

Mr. HUDSON. When we seized their ships of war did we pay them for them?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; furthermore, these are not ships of war. These are private ships.

Mr. HUDSON. Were they not their reserve cruisers, though, which were unarmed?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. HUDSON. I think they were.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; they were not. They were passenger vessels. It was private property, and what is more, we have directly admitted through our diplomatic representatives our liability for them.

Mr. DENISON. Did I understand the gentleman to say they were seized before the war began?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Before the war began they were interned in our harbors, not exactly seized.

Mr. COX. They came here for safety.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And they were seized at the time the war began.

Mr. DENISON. They were interned and when we got into the war our Government confiscated them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We took them the same as other property, but the Government itself used these ships and used the radio stations. This is the reason the Government is liable for them, as our diplomatic representatives have agreed.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. My recollection is that at the time the ships were seized, at least a considerable number of them had been very seriously damaged by the German crews; and as I understand it, that is to be taken into consideration in arriving at the value of the ships at the time they were taken.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes, of course. The bill provides for the appointment of an arbiter to hear the evidence and determine how much these ships were worth; not worth to the German owners before the war, but what they were worth under the particular circumstances under which they were seized and the particular condition in which our Government found them.

Some of them were injured to some extent and some were not. The *Leviathan*, for example—the former *Vaterland*—was not injured at all, except it had been in the harbor there for quite a while and some of its machinery was rusty.

Mr. NEWTON. But the *Crown Princess Cecile*, which was later the *Mount Vernon*, was very badly damaged in its internal machinery?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes, it was; but we pay for it only in the condition it was in when seized and what it was worth considering the fact also that these people could not use these ships until after the war was over.

Mr. NEWTON. That was my understanding.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. All these matters are to be considered and the total amount to be allowed for these ships, radio stations, patents, and so on is not to exceed, under the bill, \$100,000,000. We have put a stop limit on it.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HOOPER. There is no return of property involved in any one of these settlements between Germany and the United States, but it is all a money transaction? There is no return, in other words, of ships or of property or of anything of that sort?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think not, but I would not be sure about that. Where they have the identical property in the form of real estate in some cases it may be the property itself is to be returned.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Possibly the gentleman has already stated it, but what is the total amount of the claims of the German nationals against the American Government?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The German nationals have no claims against the American Government itself, except for the ships, radios, and so forth. They have claims against this property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How much is that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I stated that a short time ago. The total amount of the German property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian is a little over \$245,000,000.

Mr. COX. The claims of the German nationals are represented by these claims of the German citizens for ships taken by this Government.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The purpose of my question was really to also ascertain the amount of the claims of American citizens against the German Government; the total of the claims already adjusted by the Mixed Claims Commission?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is given on page 23 of the report, and the total estimated awards is \$186,000,000.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Those claims in the first instance will be paid out of the United States Treasury? This bill directs that they shall be paid at once with interest?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; this bill provides for the creation of a fund by taking 20 per cent of the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, the unallocated interest, 50 per cent of the amount appropriated for the payment of the German ships, on the one hand, and all together creating a fund.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Amounting to about how much as a preliminary fund?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The total amount of that fund immediately available will be \$138,000,000.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Then there will be the difference between \$138,000,000 and \$186,000,000, which will be paid by the Treasury.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That will be deferred.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will be deferred in part and eventually paid.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How will the Treasury be reimbursed for that \$48,000,000, being the difference between the \$138,000,000 and the \$186,000,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Treasury will not pay this. It will be paid out of the fund for which provision is made in the bill.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. But in the first part of the bill the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay these claims out of money in the Treasury.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; the provision in the bill is for payment out of a fund which is created.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is not that to be met out of the annuities?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am referring to section 3, paragraphs (a) and (b), where it is stated—

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay an amount equal to the principal of each award so certified, plus the interest thereon.

This contemplates payment out of the Treasury, does it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That refers to the wards of the Mixed Claims Commission, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay an amount equal to the principal of such award at the rate fixed in the award so certified.

And they are only taken out of the special-deposit accounts created by section 5. The gentleman will find that in section (d).

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And there are no moneys to be paid out of the Treasury except those represented by the special-deposit fund for the value of the ships—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will read the report he will find how the fund is created.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And that will equal the amount claimed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will equal it all together.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. What some of us are worrying about is whether the taxpayers are going to pay claims of our citizens against the German Government?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; our taxpayers pay nothing in the end except for the German patents, the vessels, and the radios.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will pardon me, might it not work out so that the Government would have to pay its own nationals by taxation—in the event that the German Government should fail to meet its obligations under the Dawes agreement, would not this Government in the fulfillment of the promise here made its nationals in this bill have to make good their claims? I think that follows logically. It is only in that event that a considerable, or any, burden would be put on the taxpayers of this country, except it may be fairly said that the appropriation of the \$50,000,000 may be somewhat of a burden, but half of it is to be used for the purpose of reimbursing the claims of the German nationals for the value of the ships seized by the American Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman may be correct about that, but I do not think any harm will result from it.

Mr. COX. I do not, either. I am taking the position that this Government owes it to its nationals to make good their claims against the German Government, because this Government sought to represent its nationals in a treaty made with Germany, and it entered into such an agreement that practically denies its nationals all hope of having their claims satisfied because of the indefinite time of payment under this arrangement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman does not mean that our Government could have gone over and collected the claims of Germany? Germany is a bankrupt Government.

Mr. COX. I know; I agree with the gentleman. Our nationals had to act through the Government. The Government represented its nationals in the adjustment of their claims against the German Government and made arrangements that could not possibly be satisfactory to anyone. The plan of payment by the German Government, if followed, would mean that few would ever be paid. I am prepared to accept the idea that this Government, because of its blunderings made in arranging for satisfaction of its nationals' claim, owes them the duty of seeing their claims are satisfied without unnecessary delay.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think our Government did well to get what it did.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. What amount has the German Government paid American claimants?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It has not paid anything. It has paid considerable sums to the American Government, which it now holds.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It returned all property in kind.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; the gentleman from Illinois is correct. The German Government did not confiscate any American property.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Are those claims to that extent paid?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The money has not been turned over to them; there is quite a large sum in the hands of the Government which can be used, something like \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000—possibly more.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has the convention between the United States and Germany been extended? My understanding is that the period of time for filing claims has been under negotiation between the State Department and Germany.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A further extension for the presentation of claims I think has been dropped, but I can not state that positively.

Mr. PEERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. PEERY. In fixing the value of the vessels under the survey made by the Navy Department I note that they say that the aggregate value would not exceed \$33,000,000. Now, I understand that the value of the ships is to be fixed by an arbitrator.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. PEERY. Are there any rules governing the exercise of his judgment as to value?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They are laid down in the bill. In reference to the value being fixed at \$33,000,000, we sold a small portion of the ships, and some of the poorest ones brought \$17,000,000. So I think it absurd to say that the value was not more than \$33,000,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that we have spent some ten or twelve million dollars in reconditioning some of them?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; but that does not enter into the situation at all. We only pay for those ships as we found them at the time, and we pay for them taking into consideration the fact that the owners could not use them until the end of the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Take the *Leviathan*, for example. Have we not spent something like \$8,000,000 on that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think we have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And does our Government get that back when we return that ship to Germany?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; but we will not return the ship. We will pay for the ship in the condition in which we took it and we shall keep it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I wish the gentleman would inform us what is the reason, in his judgment, why the fundamental provisions of the treaty between the United States and Germany with regard to all this property and this whole subject are not lived up to and followed rather than this new plan which is brought in?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The reason is that you can not get it through Congress. You could not get a bill passed by the House and the Senate, and I do not believe by either House, which would provide for our confiscating all the German property and paying it on American claims, or, on the other hand, of our paying the German claims in full, and paying no attention to the provisions of the Berlin treaty that provided that we should hold that property until suitable provision had been made for the payment of the American claims.

Mr. COX. But will not the gentleman agree that the arrangement proposed by this bill does violate the terms of the Prussian treaty of 1828, which was in force at the time that war was declared against Germany and which was entered into for the express purpose of taking care of war conditions?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There are about a dozen reasons that I could give in answer to that. In the first place, the Prussian treaty was not a treaty with the governments that subsequently existed. It is true it did announce a principle which this Government has consistently adhered to ever since, but the matter that finally decided it was the Berlin treaty, which set aside all other treaties and which now controls the matter. This provided that we should hold that property until suitable provision had been made for the American claims.

In the face of that I do not believe that you could get 25 Members of this House to vote for absolutely turning back all of the German property without making any provision for the American claims.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And did not the treaty provide that Germany should remit all liability for the claims of its citizens, equitable or otherwise, upon the funds in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no. The provision to which the gentleman refers was with reference to other claims outside of the property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Under the Berlin treaty Germany has made so-called suitable provision for the payment of these claims. Is not that right? The agreement was entered into, and Germany could not make a different agreement with the United States, if she wanted to, because the allied countries would not let her.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not see how you can construe a provision in a treaty having reference to future arrangements so as to apply it to arrangements that had already been made.

Mr. KEARNS. The arrangements have already been made, and they have agreed to pay 2½ per cent. Suppose she had agreed to pay 2¼ per cent additional to us; what would England and the rest of the countries say?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not agree with the gentleman. I do not think suitable arrangements have been made.

Mr. COX. Let me make this suggestion. Under the Berlin treaty the American Government obligated itself to return all alien enemy property whensoever Germany should make suitable arrangements for the payment of American nationals in their claims against Germany. Now, when this Government entered into arrangements with Germany whereby agreement was made as to terms by which American nationals should be paid, then suitable arrangements, sanctioned and approved by this Government, had been made, and the obligation was upon this Government to make immediate return of all of the alien private property.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think I need answer that statement, but I will state this: The situation is just the same as though I held the property of a debtor and he wanted to have it back and I said, "I will give you back some of it; I will give you back all of it when you make suitable arrangement for the payment of debts that you owe me." That refers to future action. It does not refer to past action.

Mr. COX. All right; but when I execute you a lien on my property have I not made suitable arrangements?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly; we are merely enforcing the lien.

Mr. COX. But there is no such provision in the Berlin treaty.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is what it does provide. It says it shall be retained until—and what does that "until" refer to? It refers to the future.

Mr. COX. Absolutely; and the terms to be made in the future are fulfilled by the agreement made.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Making an agreement with reference to the future does not provide that the present arrangement is sufficient. We shall still retain this property until suitable arrangement has to be made. I do not care to argue the matter further.

Mr. COX. What does the gentleman understand to be meant by the agreement made with Germany under which Germany was to undertake the payment of our nationals? Was not that the arrangement referred to in the first treaty?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; that is exactly what it did not mean.

Mr. CROWTHER. I would like, with the permission of the gentleman, to ask the gentleman from Georgia to what he refers as a suitable arrangement having been made. Is that for the Dawes reparation plan?

Mr. COX. Absolutely.

Mr. CROWTHER. It is not considered a suitable proportion—

Mr. COX. The American Government, representing the American nationals, considered it suitable by agreeing to it.

Mr. CROWTHER. Not for the payment of these claims.

Mr. COX. Absolutely.

Mr. CROWTHER. No. I want the gentleman to show me where that is. No such decision has been made.

Mr. COX. There has been no adjudication of the question except that made by the Government in making it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I must decline to permit the gentleman to argue this matter. I think I have proceeded far enough, but I want to say a few words in conclusion, and I want to repeat in answer to remarks of gentlemen that the use of the word "until" refers to the future, until they made these suitable arrangements, and up to this day "suitable provision" has not been made.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am sorry I said anything. The gentleman can make his own argument. Now, I am perfectly aware there are some features of this bill, some details, which Members prefer to have changed. Probably that is true in reference to every other committee having these matters reported from a committee; but the committee unanimously agreed to sink its little differences they might have in the preparation of the bill and report this bill to the House as the best solution, possibly, which could be made.

The bill has been worked out as a compromise on the part of the committee, as well as on the part of the claimants. I do not assert that it will result in exact justice being done. The complicated nature of the situation makes this practically impossible. I do insist that it offers a practical solution of the difficult problem, and in general it is fair and equitable. There may be some who do not favor the bill, because they consider that some claimants have not received everything to which they

are entitled. Before they speak and before they vote on this bill let me say to them that the very persons on whose behalf they are acting hope they will refrain from any opposition to the bill.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to one more question, and I promise that I will not ask another? Does the gentleman think Congress ought to permit an arrangement between private parties to control our policy as to the course Congress ought to adopt?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think when opposing claimants agree and say they are perfectly satisfied, that they want to have Congress pass it, it is the best Congress can do. There is one feature I omitted. This bill provides that American claims not exceeding \$100,000 shall be paid, and it also provides that all death claims on the part of American citizens shall be paid. Now, that resulted in deferring American claims a little further off; but the large claims, such as the Standard Oil and others, all were agreeable to that provision. They said they could wait, but those people suffering such losses could not wait.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Many of us are not concerned at all about these claims, but the question with us is, Is it fair to the American Government and the American taxpayer? I wonder if the gentleman, in whom we have such great confidence, will assure us, some of us have not been able to master all the details of this complicated plan—and I am approaching the matter with some little trepidation—if the gentleman would be willing to assure us that in his solemn judgment as far as the danger to the taxpayer is concerned, as far as our Government is concerned, it is a perfectly proper and perfectly just proceeding.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think so. I do not believe it will cost the American Government a cent except what it justly owes for the ships, radios, and other properties which we seized.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am in favor of the bill and shall vote for it. When it came up last year I asked the question then and I ask it now. Did the committee give further consideration to the claims made by private insurance companies who were amply rewarded by their premiums during the war? Does the gentleman think they ought to be paid 100 cents on the dollar after they were paid in part for claims against Germany?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Personally and as an abstract matter of justice I think they ought not to be paid, but as a matter of law and of treaty I do not know of any way to get out of paying them. The treaty provided that these claims should be submitted to the Mixed Commission. The Mixed Commission found that these insurance claims were proper and just, and so in my opinion we are bound by the treaty to pay them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will not the gentleman take another minute to answer the second part of that question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I would like to proceed for just a few minutes further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not have to ask unanimous consent. Half of the time belongs to him. We are on general debate. That was our agreement at the time. I am saying that for the guidance of the Chair in his ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi, the Chair thinks he ought to say that according to the understanding of the Chair no man has the right to occupy more than one hour except by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa to proceed for 10 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I was very glad to get that answer, but I take issue with the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on this, however, that it seems to me that it is reserved to Congress only to say whether that right is well established. I am not a lawyer, much less an international lawyer, but it seems to me that Congress ought to assume the responsibility of declaring what that policy shall be.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think when we make a solemn treaty we ought to abide by it. I do not like this arrangement myself, but we are bound to it.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly.

Mrs. KAHN. I would like to know if there are included in these insurance companies those German insurance companies that welshed on the payments of their policies?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think so. These are American insurance companies of which we have been speaking.

Mrs. KAHN. Some of those German insurance companies welshed. I wanted to know if they were going to get back good American money.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. I think the lady, if she will pardon me, is mistaken as to that. Some persons wanted to put in the bill a provision to withhold from the companies to which the lady refers property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. There was before the committee some argument favoring that, but the committee was opposed to it.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. There are some German insurance companies whose property is now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. DENISON. I am sure of it; and when this property is returned to the German claimants those insurance companies will get their payments just as other German nationals will get theirs. These German insurance companies referred to failed to pay the losses.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know how that could occur. If the property was here in America, they could get their claims paid if the claims were legal.

Mr. DENISON. It was in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. It must have been in the United States before the Alien Property Custodian seized it. It must have been here, otherwise the Alien Property Custodian could not have seized it, and if there was any legal claim it could have been collected.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. I agree perfectly with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] as to the German insurance companies.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The Alien Property Custodian is one functionary and the Mixed Claims Commission is another. So far as the Mixed Claims Commission is concerned, they have not had anything to do with it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The passage of this bill is urgent. There are certain people who are actually praying that this bill should be passed. At present we are getting nowhere and doing nothing. Our further failure to act would be a proof of inefficiency and it would constitute a reproach upon our honor and a conviction on the part of people abroad that even with funds set aside in the Treasury for this purpose we are not willing to make the payments which are already too long deferred. It is true that some of these payments are deferred 20 years. This bill makes only the first step in the settlement of these claims, but, in my judgment, within five years the situation in Germany will be such that all of these claims can be concluded. I think action here should be no longer delayed and I trust the bill will be passed by so large a majority as to demonstrate to the German Government that the American Government insists on being fair in its national dealings and at the same time protects the rights of its own citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to make a request of the committee. I believe that the questions asked by the Members are very important and very illuminating and do much toward bringing out the real facts, but owing to the fact that the report on this bill came out only on yesterday and several Members have asked me to make an explanation of the bill itself, I would like to proceed about 8 or 10 minutes without any interruption, and then I shall be glad to yield for any question which any Members desire to ask, because I have always tried to answer questions as best I could.

Now, I want at the outset to say that this bill is a non-partisan measure, like other measures that were connected with the war.

During the period of the war the members of the Ways and Means Committee sat around the committee table and raised \$35,000,000,000, more or less, necessary to carry on that war. During that entire time, if a stranger from another country had been present, he could not have told on which side the Democrats sat and on which side the Republicans sat, because it was nonpartisan and we were all for America. This bill grows out of the war, and actuated by that same nonpartisan spirit we have considered it. I want to reiterate what the chairman of the committee has said that no bill has ever come before our committee that was more technical in its nature. We studied it longer and spent more time on this bill than perhaps any other bill considered by the committee for some time.

Let us see what the bill is. This bill has two purposes: First, to return to Germany the property we seized belonging to German nationals; and, second, to return to American claimants the money Germany owes them. The American claims may be divided into two classes. First, claims of the United States; and, second, claims of American nationals. When war was declared in Europe the German Army went into Belgium and destroyed or took over and converted to their use a great deal of American property. Germany owes American nationals \$180,000,000, in round figures, for property they destroyed and for property they took. This includes death claims arising out of such catastrophes as the sinking of the *Lusitania* and other ships. In addition to that they owe the Government of the United States \$60,000,000. This claim for the most part is for ships that were owned by the United States and which Germany sunk on the high seas before war was declared. To recapitulate, Germany therefore owes, in round figures, to both the nationals of America and the Government of the United States \$250,000,000 or \$255,000,000.

Before war was declared a great many German ships, in order to escape capture, came into our ports. Two months before war between the United States and Germany was declared the President of the United States, speaking through the Secretary of State, gave an assurance that German vessels which had sought an asylum of refuge in America would not be taken over by the United States in the event of war; that we would not take advantage of the fact that we had permitted them to come in and then afterwards confiscate them in the event of a war between the two countries.

Then as soon as war was declared anywhere from \$350,000,000 to \$400,000,000 worth of property in the United States belonging to various German citizens and German interests was seized and placed in the hands of an Alien Property Custodian. The Alien Property Custodian sold some of that property and there is to-day \$180,000,000 received from those sales in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, all of which was put into Liberty bonds.

It has been nearly 10 years after the war and the question arises: What are we going to do with this money? And what are we going to do with the rest of the German property? How are we going to satisfy both the German claims and the American claims? We could do, my friends, like the Allies did, and I am not criticizing them. The treaty of Versailles provided that the Allies should take the property of German nationals that they had seized and apply that property to claims that their nationals had against Germany. We were not a party to the treaty of Versailles, but in the treaty of Berlin, when we made our treaty with Germany, we reserved the right to take advantage of any provision given to any other country in the treaty of Versailles.

Under the provisions of the Berlin treaty, under a decision of the United States Supreme Court, and under many rules of international law the United States has the legal right as well as the power, if it so desires, to confiscate all of the property now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, including all of these ships and 2,200 patents amounting to about \$7,500,000. We took over a couple of radio stations valued at \$1,000,000, and we could also confiscate them. We have the right under international law, we have the right under an opinion of the Supreme Court, and we have the right under the treaty of Berlin, if we so desire, to confiscate and take that property. But, my friends, we have precedents in America from the time this country took its place among the nations of the earth to the contrary. In 1802, when we had a population of less than three and a half million people, the United States Government paid out of the Public Treasury \$3,000,000—an enormous sum in those days—to reimburse the nationals of England for property that we had taken during the Revolutionary War.

There are two courses open to this House; that is, to follow the plan of our allies and confiscate this property or to return

it to German nationals. To me it is abhorrent to every idea of justice to take the property of individuals to pay the debts of a nation. I believe we should return this property to its former owners. But what are we going to do about the money they owe us? My friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is very much concerned over this matter. My friends, I want to say to you and to the gentleman from Georgia that I believe in giving exact justice to Germany. But I do not believe in granting more justice to Germany than that granted to our own American citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will permit me, may I say my chief concern is in seeing this Government fulfill its every engagement, whether made with its own nationals or with the other powers of the world.

Mr. COLLIER. I am sure of that. I have the highest opinion of both the gentleman's purpose and the splendid ability which he has shown on this and many other occasions and which I know he will show Monday when he makes the great speech which I know he is going to make on the question at that time. I will be pleased a little later on when I get through with the elements to discuss this with my friend from Georgia further. I would like to proceed now a few moments more on the bill. I have not told you yet what is in the bill; in fact, neither the chairman nor myself have gone into the details of the bill.

In the treaty of Berlin the American Government was given a priority with respect to the cost of the army of occupation. This has really nothing to do with the bill, but I want to state it for the reason the question is asked why we preferred in priorities the citizens of the United States above the Government of the United States. My answer to that is that the Federal Government reserved to itself priority in the treaty of Berlin. The \$13,000,000 that Germany pays for the cost of the army of occupation must be paid first, and we did not feel the Government ought to take priority over its citizens all the time.

In the treaty of Versailles it was determined by a commission appointed for that purpose that Germany should be assessed damages of 132,000,000,000 gold marks, which amounted in our money to about \$35,000,000,000. It was absolutely impossible for Germany to pay this, and if I may use a common expression used in connection with business concerns, Germany did just like a corporation would have done if it found its liabilities far beyond its resources. They practically went into the hands of a receiver, and the result was the Dawes Commission and the Dawes annuities.

Under the Dawes annuities—and this is a very important matter in connection with this bill—the various nations received a pro rata part of Germany's annual reparation payments based on what was believed to be Germany's capacity to pay. The part of the United States was two and a quarter per cent, or, to be accurate, about \$10,700,000 annually. This was the part the United States was to receive on the Dawes annuity to be applied to the settlement of American claims.

The Allies were anxious for the United States to adopt the same principle which they had adopted for two reasons: One was because, perhaps, it would have looked better, although I do not care to dwell on that phase of the matter. We are not concerned with reasons which actuated other nations; but the Allies had a business reason for wanting us to adopt their plan.

If we had taken the German property in our hands and turned it over to American claimants, then we would not have participated in this \$10,700,000 Dawes annuity, and that amount would have gone into the common fund and the share of the Allies on a pro rata basis would have been increased accordingly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman is a member of the committee which drafted this bill, and I know is always able to explain any bill that comes out of his committee. I have claimants both ways on this matter, and what they would like to know is this: How much money has the Alien Property Custodian, either the property of Germany or of the nationals of Germany?

Mr. COLLIER. That is a very pertinent question, because I want to show you now how we provide for these payments.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] asked a very pertinent question when he asked the chairman of the committee if he thought the Congress in the settlement of claims ought to be controlled by the desires and wishes and agreements of the claimants themselves. I will answer that question like, I presume, the chairman did, although I was called out of the room just as the gentleman propounded his question. I say that

Congress should not be so controlled, but when we have other people's money and when we have been trying for 10 years to distribute and properly return it and those on both sides get together and say if we distribute it in this way it will satisfy them, while we might not be bound by that, I will say it was a very persuading factor in the consideration of this matter.

In answer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] it is variously estimated that the amount of German property seized by the Alien Property Custodian is between \$350,000,000 and \$400,000,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Belonging to Germany?

Mr. COLLIER. Belonging to the citizens of Germany. Our claims are \$255,000,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Our claims are \$255,000,000?

Mr. COLLIER. Two hundred and fifty-five millions dollars.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, said we are holding only a portion of that money. How much are we reserving for payment of the claims of Americans?

Mr. COLLIER. I will give the gentleman the plan which we adopted. I do not consider it is an ideal plan because there is one feature in the plan which I do not like at all, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] put his hand on it—the insurance feature. I do not like that at all. I do not think it is fair. But we are dealing with a commission which is an international commission. We can not amend its report. Its report was made by a representative from Germany, a representative from the United States, and a third party, the umpire; and when the report is made, if we attempt to amend it, the two representatives of the countries and the umpire have to get together again; and while there may be, and there is, a technical and legal right to give these insurance companies the money, yet I am not in sympathy with that part of the bill. However, I am not going to permit that to prevent me from supporting this measure and restoring this money to these people, because it has been delayed so long it is now time for us to get away from these war claims.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, who is on a committee that at one time looked into this matter.

Mr. RAYBURN. I presume neither the gentleman nor the committee he represents contends that the recommendation of this commission is building on the Congress?

Mr. COLLIER. Certainly not; but whenever we change a question of fact, after it has practically been agreed on, while it may not be binding upon this House, yet it jeopardizes the proceedings, and Germany itself, through its agent, was willing to pay this money. It is an American claim against Germany, and if their representative was ready and willing and agreed to pay it, I am not going to get mad myself enough to jeopardize this bill on that account.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was simply trying to establish what was the committee's idea of the principle involved. My conception of this whole matter is that Congress is always supreme in such matters and is not bound by any finding of any commission anywhere; not even commissioners to bring about a peace treaty, or anything of that sort.

Mr. COLLIER. That is true; and if a majority vote of this House and the Senate so declares, and the President signs such a bill, we can confiscate every dollar of this property and every single ship, if we want to, and we would be acting within our rights under the law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The committee was controlled largely, at least I was, by the provisions of the treaty. These awards have been made in pursuance of the treaty, and although we have the power to enact some law to violate the treaty, I do not think it ought to be done. Nobody has suggested a solution as to where the money should go. The Germans have agreed, and are willing to pay it, and where should it go?

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if it appeared that the insurance companies had charged war insurance rates?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It was shown that the insurance companies had made no unreasonable profits.

Mr. JONES. Why should they have a return of the money?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is a well-known principle of law that they are subrogated to the rights of the parties insured.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said that he did not think the insurance companies

were entitled to it, but he does not want to jeopardize the passage of the bill. Why can not we amend the bill to exclude payment to the insurance companies.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And then have no bill.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Why can not the bill be amended and the insurance claims be thrown out?

Mr. COLLIER. I suppose it could, but they tell me it would defeat it. Oh, I see so many things done that I think can not be done, and so many things not done that I think can be done that I do not know.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I understand they propose to return a part of the money at once and not to hold it for the debts of the Americans.

Mr. COLLIER. I am coming to that. It is a complicated arrangement. If the House will give me its attention I will explain it now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. You are not holding all the money for the payment of the American citizens' claims?

Mr. COLLIER. We are going to pay Germany 80 per cent at the start.

Mr. COX. But you have already paid claims under \$10,000?

Mr. COLLIER. Now, I want to say two things. First, the value of the ships was a matter of great controversy and probably will be a matter of great controversy under the five-minute rule. That is where the only appropriation lies. The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$100,000,000 to pay for the ships that Germany brought into the country before the war and which we seized. It provides further for the appropriation of only \$50,000,000, the other \$50,000,000 being deferred as we hope forever.

Now, there is going to be a great deal of complaint on that. I want to say to the Members on both sides that as far as we can learn, after making all the inquiry everywhere we could, we find that the American Government is not going to lose a cent, even if the entire \$100,000,000 is appropriated. We have used a good many of the vessels—we used them during the war—and their value to us at the time when we needed vessels was very great. We have also sold a number of these vessels, and even if we have to expend the entire \$100,000,000, I repeat, I do not believe the Federal Government will be out anything on the shipping business. We hope that we will not have to appropriate over \$50,000,000.

What is the value of the ships? There is a real conflict between the United States and Germany. We claim they are worth \$33,000,000 and they claim they are worth \$330,000,000, or ten times as much.

Now, we made an arbitrary yardstick to measure value of the ships. Here is the yardstick. We assess the value of the ships, what they were worth when they entered the American ports, minus the loss to Germany in not being able to use them during the war; the fact that they were laid up and out of use and thereby was a loss to Germany over an indeterminate period which meant the end of the war.

It might have been five months or six months or three years or five years. That is for the arbiter to decide what this would amount to. Taking that into consideration he is going to determine the valuation of the ships. We get \$10,700,000 a year under the Dawes plan to pay for American claims, and Germany has agreed to pay every year this \$10,700,000 to pay off American claimants until all claims are satisfied. Why do we not turn the German property over to them then and accept the Dawes payment in return? Because it would take the American claimants 75 years to get their money back under that plan. And suppose—although we hope not—that after 10 or 15 years Germany quits making those payments. Then American claimants would never get their money. So, while I say we want to be fair and just to Germany, we do not want to give the German claimants any priority over our own citizens.

What are we going to do? The bill provides that German nationals shall be paid 80 per cent of their claims at once, but that "at once" does not mean right now. [Laughter.] I have had several men come up and say, "I am never going to vote to pay 80 per cent of Germany's claims right now and not settle the American claims until 1933." Amongst the German claimants there have been a great many deaths and other changes in ownership. I believe implicitly that a great part of the American claimants will be paid long before a considerable part of that 80 per cent will be paid to Germany, because of the difficulty they are going to have in adjudicating and proving their claims, while our claims are already adjudicated. Now then, we will give them 80 per cent when they prove the claims. We now come to American claimants. We are going to sell all of the

German property. The Alien Property Custodian is empowered to do that, and we are going to arbitrarily take 20 per cent of what we receive from the sale of German property, which will be \$40,000,000, and we are going to put that in a fund from which we will pay American claims. For convenience we will call this fund the pot. On the \$180,000,000 of Liberty bonds that we purchased from the sale of German property unallocated interest has accrued which amounts to \$23,000,000. We are going to put that in the pot. That gives us \$40,000,000 and \$23,000,000, so that we have \$73,000,000 in the pot. Then we appropriate \$50,000,000 for ships, and we are going to give \$25,000,000 of that to the fellows that lost the ships and we are going to take the other \$25,000,000 and put that in the pot. That makes \$98,000,000. We have already received two payments under the Dawes plan amounting in round numbers to about \$23,000,000, and we are going to put that in the pot. We have now put in the pot about \$120,000,000. What are we going to do with that money? We are going to pay every dollar in that pot to American citizens and claimants, and we are going to pay under a certain order of priority. The first priority will be the expenses of the commission. The second priority, which amounts to \$4,000,000, and that which comes first of all claims, are what are called death claims and personal-injury cases. We are going to pay \$4,000,000 and satisfy every claim resulting from the deaths and personal injuries where awards have been granted to American claimants by the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. DEAL. And are you going to pay that "at once"?

Mr. COLLIER. Pay them at once; and that means right now, as soon as the bill is passed. There will be no delay about those claims, because they have all been adjudicated. These claims amount to \$4,000,000. Then we are going to take \$20,000,000 out of that pot and pay off every American claim that amounts to \$100,000 or less. That leaves a balance in the pot of about \$82,000,000. The payment of this \$33,000,000 satisfies the claim of every American national less than \$200,000. We will then take \$17,800,000 and award \$100,000 on account of all other American claims, which will cut down the pot to \$64,000,000; \$6,000,000 will then be used to pay accrued interest to American claimants, leaving in the pot approximately \$58,000,000. All American claimants will participate in the remainder, share and share alike, until the pot is exhausted.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman to say that the claims of the German nationals have not yet been adjudicated. Did they come before the same Mixed Claims Commission that our people presented their claims to?

Mr. COLLIER. What I meant by not being adjudicated is that they have not been adjudicated before our Claims Commission.

Mr. SNELL. Do they come to our Claims Commission for final approval?

Mr. COLLIER. They will have to go to the umpire. He is the man charged with the sale of these ships and paying off those claims. It is a tremendous responsibility for one man, but the bill provides it.

Mr. SNELL. Are they adjudicated over there or settled to a certain extent that a certain amount belongs to one man; and has that been referred to this umpire over here?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; and the umpire is the final arbiter.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is not that limited to ships, radios, and patents?

Mr. SNELL. I am asking about German nationals.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Oh, that is a matter of bookkeeping; that is all settled.

Mr. COLLIER. Gentlemen, the difficulty is going to be in Germany, not over here. We will have deaths, and so forth, and the delay is going to be caused in Germany.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is not there a confusion in the mind of the gentleman from New York. The claim of the average German property owner we know how much it is, but what we do not know is the property taken by the German Government—ships, radio, and patents.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They are all together.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. We know how much the claim of the individual German property owner is.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman made the statement that some Members objected to paying 80 per cent of the German claims, and the reason the gentleman approved doing that is because the German claims have not yet been adjudicated.

Mr. COLLIER. Perhaps I had the wrong idea. The gentleman from New York states that as far as the nationals themselves are concerned the difficulty which we understand has arisen in Germany would delay very materially.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is to be made by a new officer set up in this bill, that of arbiter, a new position created in this bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. To make it clear, there are three tribunals. The Alien Property Custodian, before whom the German claims go except those relating to ships, radio, and patents. The owner of those will go to the arbiter, for whose election there is a provision in this bill. The American claims all go before the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. COLLIER. That is right.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. You have those three different tribunals.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLIER. I will.

Mr. HASTINGS. What does the gentleman say is the amount of our Government claims?

Mr. COLLIER. Our own Government claims \$60,000,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. The next question. How much of this money has been put in the pot? Will not all of that money be exhausted by it being paid to our American nationals before our Government claims are paid?

Mr. COLLIER. If Germany fails to keep her agreement at all? That is the idea of holding 20 per cent.

Mr. HASTINGS. Are we holding enough of German property to be absolutely sure that all the claims of our nationals and all the claims of our own Government will be paid?

Mr. COLLIER. I think so.

Mr. HASTINGS. Now, does the gentleman have any doubt about that?

Mr. COLLIER. I will say this to the gentleman—

Mr. HASTINGS. Has the gentleman any doubt about that? That is the point I am after.

Mr. COLLIER. Let me say this to the gentleman: I have a note here that in 1933 the entire pot will be exhausted.

Mr. HASTINGS. Under this arrangement when will all the claims of our Government be paid—through what series of years?

Mr. COLLIER. Well, I could not say.

Mr. HASTINGS. Run over 62 years, as with some—

Mr. COLLIER. Oh, no; nothing like that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, 25 years?

Mr. COLLIER. I could not answer the gentleman accurately.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. About 17 years for final payment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do we take the German Government's lien on the property?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. For part of it.

Mr. HASTINGS. What part of the security will remain after this pot is exhausted?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Twenty per cent.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is another question—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will call attention to the fact the American claimants are perfectly satisfied with that.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am looking after the American Government. Is it not going to give the Government anything?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We have forty or fifty million dollars of claims arising against the German Government.

Mr. HASTINGS. How is the American Government to be paid, or when? Are we reserving enough money in this pot to pay for the next few years?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They go under the Dawes agreement.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is another question.

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman does not give me time to answer either one.

Mr. HASTINGS. What I want to get down to in the last analysis is, I want to know when we can expect the American claims to be paid, and when the Government of the United States claims are to be paid, which are fifty or sixty million dollars?

Mr. COLLIER. That would depend, of course, solely and alone upon the question whether or not we collected the promissory notes of the other governments. Whenever you accept a series of promissory notes and can go before a committee and say positively that you know when these notes will be paid, then I can speak positively about this.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then we are releasing some property we have now as security and are taking our chances to collect?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. You say that according to the treaty of Berlin it was agreed between our Government and the Government of Germany that the property of the German nationals in this country should not be confiscated and the proceeds applied to the payment of these debts to our nationals and our own American Government?

Mr. COLLIER. I would not go so far as to say we agreed to such a proposition. But in the very preamble of that

treaty we stated that we were not going to do it. But there is an implied statement running all through that treaty showing that we could do it. There is no question on that. The United States has absolutely got the legal right, sanctioned by international law and the Supreme Court decisions, if it wanted to, to take every dollar of that fund.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then the gentleman is not as positive now as he was a few moments ago as to the effect of that law and the treaty of Berlin?

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman will permit, I think I can shed some light on the question involved in the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from Oklahoma. I want to say that this is the most complete report ever submitted by the committee in explanation of a very complicated bill, and I commend the consideration of it to our Members.

But in answer to the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma, he will find on page 12 of the report, item 2—

Awards on behalf of the United States Government: Principal of awards entered, \$42,034,794.41; interest to January 1, 1928, on awards entered, \$19,203,567.03; a total of principal and interest of \$61,238,361.44.

Now, as I understand the inquiry of the gentleman from Oklahoma to the gentleman from Mississippi, it is whether or not we have security for the \$61,000,000 of indebtedness, that it will be in the hands of our Government if we pay the claims of the German nationals?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. The reply I would make the gentleman is this: While we have an indisputed right, as he has time and time again said, to confiscate this property, that is not the duty of our Congress. I do not think that any of us want to do that. And further than that, the money that we are now holding under the Mixed Claims Commission—or, rather, under the Alien Property Custodian—is the property of German individuals. Therefore we can not pay that individual money of a German citizen and call it as part of the German national fund to pay our national debt.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did we provide that in our treaty of Berlin?

Mr. TREADWAY. That is in the treaty.

Mr. HASTINGS. Why did we put it in?

Mr. TREADWAY. You should ask that question of the officials who made the treaty. It is not for us to answer. It is fair to say this, however, that this being public money, not being collateral for a private claim, we must pay under the treaty with Germany in so far as our security for the payment of the national claims can admit it.

Mr. HASTINGS. If we put that in the treaty for priority, why do we turn around now and relinquish that right?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Suitable provision should be made. The gentleman from Georgia thinks suitable provision for that should be made now. I do not think so.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Certainly.

Mr. RAINEY. How much does the German Government owe us on our expenses of occupation?

Mr. COLLIER. Two hundred and fifty-five million dollars.

Mr. RAINEY. We could scale that down a little bit?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. That is to be paid out of the Dawes reparations?

Mr. COLLIER. That has nothing to do with the treaty of reparation and the treaty of Berlin. The Government took priority on that. If they make only one payment it would go on the army of occupation.

Mr. RAINEY. How are we going to get paid the money due us for our army of occupation unless we get it out of the reparations?

Mr. COLLIER. There is no way that I know of except to declare war.

Mr. RAINEY. If we are to depend on that alone, and they pay it without interest, it will take 30 years under the Dawes Commission plan to reimburse us for the expense of our army of occupation. If they pay it with interest it will take from 40 to 50 years; and if you add to that \$60,000,000 to be paid to the Federal Government last of all, and that would include the reimbursing of this Government for damages due to loss of life on the *Lusitania*, you will find it will be 70 or 80 years before we can recover this money, and it would not be surprising if we had to pay those claims out of our Treasury.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I have not the floor, but I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. This bill itself in no way fixes the amount due us for the occupation of American troops or anything of that kind?

Mr. COLLIER. It has nothing in the world to do with it.

Mr. RAINEY. Except that it postpones that until last of all, and the Treasury may not get that back for 70 or 80 years.

Mr. COLLIER. Does my colleague from Illinois think we should confiscate that money and apply it to American debts?

Mr. RAINEY. I will say to my colleague that if we confiscate it we would only be following our own precedents when we confiscated the cotton that we seized in the South.

Mr. COLLIER. But two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. RAINEY. We would be following all our own precedents and also the precedents that every nation in the world has set if we confiscated it. We would be doing just what all the allied nations are doing to-day. We are abandoning all precedents and we are making history in this bill. In giving this money back we are not following the precedents already set; we are establishing a new precedent.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield for information?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. The German alien property custodian seized a great deal of property belonging to nationals of our country during the war. Can the gentleman tell us how much was so seized?

Mr. COLLIER. I have not the different allocations of that, but there were some seizures made.

Mr. BYRNS. This bill proposes, as I understand it, to return to German nationals 80 per cent of the property seized by the Alien Property Custodian of this Government?

Mr. COLLIER. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNS. Has there been any reciprocal action on the part of Germany to return to American nationals the property seized during the war by the alien property custodian of Germany?

Mr. COLLIER. There has been reciprocal action on the part of Germany.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Germany has returned all of the property taken in kind, and that was done long ago.

Mr. BYRNS. That relates to property seized in Germany?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Germany was not in a position to decide what to do with that property. The Allies took that property.

Mr. BYRNS. When was it returned and in what way?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It was simply turned back to them when the war was over.

Mr. BYRNS. I know of one or two instances where money was seized in the banks of Germany belonging to American nationals. Those gentlemen now have claims pending against Germany and they have been denied payment for many, many years. Has Germany returned the money?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Germany was willing to pay them, but at the time she only had depreciated currency, which they would not accept. But so far as any property is concerned, like real estate, machinery, buildings, and the like, everything was returned.

Mr. BYRNS. How about money that was seized?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They tried to pay them in their own currency at the time the war closed, but they had nothing but depreciated currency, and, of course, it would not make a sufficient payment. So now those claims have been submitted to the Mixed Claims Commission and the Mixed Claims Commission is making awards to them.

Mr. BYRNS. Then I understand that what this bill proposes to do, if the gentleman will pardon me for a moment, is to return to German nationals 80 per cent of the property seized, whereas Germany will retain the money she seized and the property she seized.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But it is being paid to them now through awards made by the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I must ask the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Illinois to permit me to proceed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. COLLIER. I have allowed this to go on in this way because I believe that by the asking of these questions we bring out the facts and save a great deal of time. However, I would like now to reserve two or three minutes to myself, and I ask the indulgence of the House.

Mr. COX. At some point will not the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLLIER. I see the gentleman from Georgia is not going to let me do it.

Mr. COX. I want to ask the gentleman one question, which will lead to another. The whole structure of this bill, from your interpretation, is founded upon the certainty of the fulfillment of the Dawes plan.

Mr. COLLIER. Absolutely.

Mr. COX. If the Dawes agreement falls through, under the bill there will be confiscation of at least a part of German private property?

Mr. COLLIER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COX. If the Dawes plan falls through, there will be a failure on the part of our own nationals to receive payment in full of their claims against the German Government?

Mr. COLLIER. That will not be so as long as we have that 20 per cent; but, of course, if that falls through, then there will be some confiscation of German property, but it will be because Germany does not pay and it will not be because of the confiscation of any German property.

Mr. COX. Does it not logically follow that if the Dawes arrangement falls through and there is no action on the part of this Government looking to the satisfaction of the claims of its nationals against the German Government that there will be a failure to fulfill the promise of the bill to eventually satisfy German claims and likewise failure of the promise which is made that American nationals will eventually be paid?

Mr. COLLIER. That may be true. Now, I want to take about three minutes and talk to some of these Members who are so afraid that some of our nationals are going to lose their money. I want to say that by 1933—and I believe the Dawes payments will be kept up until then—nearly 80 per cent of this amount will be paid, and that the only American claimants then left will be some of the very large claimants, some of the greatest business concerns in this country, which themselves are willing to take this chance. When we take \$33,000,000 out of the pot we have paid for the expenses of the commission and have paid off every death claim and every claim of \$100,000 or less. After \$50,800,000 has been taken out of the \$113,000,000 pot, the death and personal-injury claims will have all been paid, every claim of \$100,000 or less will have been paid, and all other American claimants will have received an additional \$100,000, and we will still have left in the pot over \$62,000,000 to help satisfy the remaining claimants, all of whom have already been paid \$200,000.

What are we going to do when the pot becomes exhausted? The Dawes payments, as they are paid, will go into the pot. American claimants remaining unpaid after 1933 will have received 80 per cent of the sum due them from Germany. After that, out of the Dawes annuities, as they are paid, German and American nationals share and share alike.

Mr. ABERNETHY and Mr. CHINDBLOM rose.

Mr. COLLIER. I yield first to my good friend from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to say to the gentleman I am not concerned so much about our citizens getting paid, but I am very much concerned, and I think a number of other Members are, at the very pertinent question of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and that is, How is this Government going to be taken care of when we are taking at least \$50,000,000 out of the Treasury at the present time and turning that money over and waiting 80 years to get back what they owe the Government? That is the thing that is bothering me.

Mr. COLLIER. Well, the Government stands a better show than any of the others, if you want it put in plain language, because we are retaining \$50,000,000, the value of the ships, to be appropriated by a future Congress at a future date; and when that money is appropriated 50 per cent of the \$50,000,000, or one-half of it, will go back into the pot, to be turned over to American claimants.

Mr. COX. And if the gentleman will permit, that \$50,000,000 is private property and not the property of the German Government.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not talking about the individuals. I know there would not be any bill if it was not for the individuals pressing it. I am thinking of the Treasury of the United States, and the gentleman says it is able to stand it. Is that the only reason we are appropriating this \$50,000,000 which we will not get back for 80 years?

Mr. COLLIER. In order to make myself understood I will say the Government has got just as much right to expect payment as any of the individuals, and the Government will be paid. I do not anticipate any trouble the Federal Government will have in getting its money back.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In other words, we have got to wait until the other Governments pay us.

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, if the Dawes payments stop, if Europe blows up, if people do not meet their obligations, if all the countries here and abroad go to the bowwows, and the currency of every nation is depreciated until it gets like it was immediately after the war, then perhaps somebody is going to lose some money.

We have got to take something on trust, gentlemen. All of our business is based on confidence. The material as well as

the moral prosperity of every community, as well as of every nation, in a large measure depends upon the degree in which the people of that community and of that nation trust each other, and we have got to allow for something along the lines of confidence.

I can not say that Germany is going to make the payment next year or 20 years from now. I do say that Germany has met her payments in the past. The reparations were fixed by a commission at what they believed to be Germany's capacity to pay, and for one I can not say that she is not going to pay, and none of you can say she will or will not pay. We have got to trust something to our confidence in the nations of the world.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to my colleague, of course.

Mr. RAINEY. Is it not true that the Reparations Commission on the petition of Germany, at any time in the future, on a showing made by her that she can not meet these reparation payments of \$600,000,000 a year, or whatever the amount is—I think it is more than that—can be relieved and another adjustment made by which she pays a still smaller amount?

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, if that becomes necessary. The gentleman is very helpful.

Mr. RAINEY. And that will postpone still further beyond the 80 years our opportunity to get back the money we are now advancing.

Mr. COLLIER. Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say that I have talked much longer than I intended—

Mr. CHINDBLOM (interposing). Before the gentleman concludes, some one inquired about the American claimants who will have to wait a while—

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; I wish the gentleman would read who they are, because some of the gentlemen are so much concerned about them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM (reading):

International Harvester Co.	\$3,316,765.92
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.	990,000.00
Western Electric Co.	1,585,089.48
The Texas Co.	547,845.03
International Mercantile Marine Co.	175,000.00
The Pfaunder Co.	125,000.00
United States Steel Products Co.	195,000.00
Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co.	337,957.00
United Shoe Machinery Corporation.	1,660,000.00
Roesler & Hasselbacher Chemical Co.	400,000.00
Security Eyelet Co.	700,000.00
United Shoe Machinery Corporation.	140,000.00
Samuel Ullmann, Emanuel S. Ullmann, and Joseph Ullmann, Jr., as surviving partners of the firm of Joseph Ullmann Co.	237,000.00
Standard Oil Co. of New York.	900,000.00
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.	134,531.25
Max Selliger.	393,806.15
Marshall Field & Co.	104,000.00
Fred W. Gravenhorst and George Gravenhorst, of Brooklyn, N. Y., doing business under the name of Gravenhorst & Co.	167,000.00
The Slinger Manufacturing Co.	4,000,000.00

And many others, all of which will be found in the hearings.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to reiterate that all claims under \$200,000 will be satisfied by 1933.

Mr. HASTINGS rose.

Mr. COLLIER. Does the gentleman want to ask a question along this line?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit, I think there is not any concern about the big claims—

Mr. COLLIER. They are the only ones that will be delayed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Because, as I understand from this debate and from the report, those having the larger claims have agreed to this.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They have.

Mr. HASTINGS. But what some of us are very much concerned about is when the claims of the American Government are to be paid or how long they are to be postponed? We are not concerned about these large claims which the gentleman from Illinois has read into the Record because, as I understand it, with their eyes open they have come in and agreed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed one hour.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Inasmuch as the gentleman has asked me a question, I may say that first there will be \$13,000,000 received from the German Government on account of the expense of the army of occupation. The total of that claim by our Government is \$255,000,000. Then there is the 2 1/4 per cent out of the Dawes reparations payments, which amounts to about \$10,700,000 per annum, and that can be used only for these claims.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does that go to pay the Government claims?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It could not be used to pay the Government claims. The Government will get its pay after the private claims have been paid.

Mr. HASTINGS. When does the gentleman estimate that the payment of the Government claims will begin?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The total time required to pay off 2 1/4 per cent of the priority mixed claims together with interest thereon, and the interest on deferred payments, is 5 years. To pay off the principle of \$123,825,000 with interest, 17 3/4 years; to pay off \$25,000,000 unallocated interest fund without interest, 2 1/2 years; making in all 25 years to pay off the private claims.

Mr. COLLIER. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in conclusion I want to say that this is the best bill that we could get. This matter has been pending for nearly 10 years; we have children and widows in this country whose husbands and fathers and brothers lost their lives, and for 10 years that money has been held in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, and we have been letting it stay there. Do you not think it time that we ought to settle this matter? We have claims of thousands of American citizens who were damaged to the extent of a few hundred dollars. This bill immediately pays off all of them, practically, you might say, under \$200,000.

Now, the first question is whether we are to appropriate \$50,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury and authorize the appropriation of \$50,000,000 more for ships which the evidence shows were worth that much to us. Another question is whether we are going to let this thing go on forever, or go ahead and confiscate the property.

We have solved the question according to our plan. The solution, I believe, has met the approval of the claimants. That is not binding, but it is gratifying to know that those interested approve the bill.

The question with us is, What will we do? I believe every safeguard possible has been thrown around the debt Germany owes to the Government of the United States. I am not concerned about those American claimants who have to wait, because, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] has shown, they are not only limited in number and possessed of great means but also they have voluntarily taken the chance of getting their pay out of the reparations made by Germany.

Now, I did not intend to take up so much time to-day in general debate, but one question brought on another, and I have let Members ask each other questions, because I believed in doing so it would facilitate the discussion. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not expect to discuss the bill before the House. I give you fair warning of that. I do want to discuss the 92 per cent index figure which the Secretary of Agriculture proclaims is the comparative situation of agriculture with other groups in the United States. He says there are only 8 points difference between the condition of agriculture and the condition of other groups. If that is true, it seems to me that agriculture has little cause to complain and has a poor case to come before the Congress and ask for special legislation.

The Secretary of Agriculture in his annual report said:

The index number indicating the purchasing power of agriculture was 92 on September 15 last, with 100 representing the average for the five years preceding the war.

This report no doubt caused the President to say in his annual message to Congress that the purchasing power of the farmer is approaching a normal figure.

These optimistic words go out over the country and news columns and editorials proclaim that agriculture is again all right—everybody from the President down taking this report from the Department of Agriculture as the literal truth.

I wish to say that I am thoroughly convinced that these figures do not reflect the true condition of agriculture and that you can not get a true picture by price comparison. You must take into consideration the quantity of an article produced on the farm as well as the price before you have any knowledge of the farmer's revenue.

Prices may be high for an agricultural product, but that generally accompanies small productions and reduced revenue. For example: Cotton is high this year, but quantity produced is low, and as a result the cotton crop this year will produce \$350,000,000 less for the farmers of the South than the crop produced in 1925. Again, corn was high in 1924 because of an exceedingly small crop, and the farmers suffered that year in revenue from the sale of corn and the livestock to which it was fed.

The index figure referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture has been raised many points this year by the price of cotton, but the revenue of cotton farmers is less than in a normal year.

The index figure in 1924 was raised many points by the high price of corn, but the revenue of farmers was reduced.

The real economic condition of the farmer is not indicated by the price he secures unless you also take into consideration the amount of the product he produces and thereby secure his actual revenue.

I have before me an article written by Mr. L. H. Bean, division of statistical and historical research, United States Department of Agriculture, on the subject of "Measures of agricultural purchasing power," in which he discusses the reliability and correctness of their index figure used so conspicuously by the Secretary of Agriculture in showing the purchasing power of the American farmer.

In this article Mr. Bean states:

The three phrases "the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar," "the purchasing power of the farmer's product," and "the purchasing power of the farmer or the farmer's income" have been used interchangeably. Much publicity has been given to the first two of these phrases without recognizing that it is the third concept, namely, the purchasing power of the farmer, which is of greatest importance. This brief paper will attempt to deal only with the outstanding differences between these three forms of agricultural purchasing power and to indicate briefly the practical significance of the purchasing power of the farmer's income as a measure of agricultural welfare.

Mr. Bean says again:

Not only have most comments on agricultural price movements been lax in their distinction between the buying power of units of farm products and the buying power of a unit of the farmer's money, but the comparisons used have resulted in questionable conclusions.

Again Mr. Bean says:

The third form of agricultural purchasing power, the purchasing power of the farmer's income, is by far the most significant, since it takes into account both the price per unit and the number of units sold.

Again Mr. Bean says:

If it is the purpose to indicate the real progress or condition of the agricultural producer, it would be best accomplished by measuring the purchasing power of the farmer's net income.

These excerpts from Mr. Bean's address are conclusive evidence that in the department of research in the Agricultural Department they look upon this index figure used by the Secretary of Agriculture as proving farm prosperity as a questionable calculation, and that the net income of the farmers of the country is the true measure of the condition of agriculture, and that while I seem to be criticizing the Department of Agriculture to-day, yet I am really in harmony with the research department.

Just to show you that the comparison using the prices only of agricultural products leads us astray I call your attention to two different tables issued by the Department of Agriculture. In one we have index numbers which are generously spread over the country, and in 1924 this index figure was 83.

Now, in the other table we have the net income of capital invested in land in the United States, which in 1924 was stated to be 3.2 per cent. A very low percentage, but, nevertheless, that is the report of the Department of Agriculture.

Now we will take these tables in 1926 and we find the index figure, developed from prices of agricultural products, shows an increase of 2 points, and came up to 85 since 1924, and therefore the farmer is more prosperous according to the Secretary of Agriculture than he was in 1924.

However, we turn over to the other table and we find in 1926 the Agricultural Department says that the net income of capital invested in land in the United States amounts to 2.7 per cent in that year. So then, according to their own reports, the index figure went up and the net returns of the farmers of the country went down probably a billion dollars.

The people in the Department of Agriculture know that this index figure, heralded over the country as evidence of the prosperity of agriculture, is not a true index of agricultural conditions.

Prices of industrial articles are different. When there is a big demand for pig iron, more is produced and prices are advanced. When the farmer raises more pigs he oversupplies the market and the price goes down. You can not compare the prices of agricultural products with the prices of industrial products and fail to reach wrong conclusions.

In my opinion there is but one way for the Agricultural Department to show to the country the condition of agriculture as it relates to all other groups, and that is to arrive at the

production of each of the articles, ascertain the price of each, and arrive at the total income of agriculture. Then compare that income with the total income of the other groups in the United States. Of course, this is done and has been done and we have the figures, but they are not heralded to the country.

Agriculture is receiving about \$12,000,000,000 a year now as its total revenue. The total national income is about \$90,000,000,000 per annum. The people engaged in agriculture are about one-third of our population and they are receiving about one-eighth of the national income.

These figures likewise come from the Agricultural Department and there is full knowledge there of this discrepancy, but the real situation does not get out to the public and is not heralded abroad by the Secretary. If this information filled the columns of the newspapers, then everybody would understand why land continues to drop in price. It would be understood why the Department of Agriculture has to report this year that land again went down in value all over the United States last year 4 per cent, 6 per cent in Ohio, and 11 per cent in Iowa.

An interesting sale of farm land was made in Champaign County, Ohio, last week. In making out the deed it was discovered that the property had been previously transferred, the last time in 1877, and the price named in the deed was 20 per cent less than the price named in the deed in 1927, which was 50 years later. It would be interesting to show the large increases in value of other kinds of property in the United States during this same 50 years.

If this true statement of the comparative conditions was everywhere known it would explain why the Department of Agriculture must report this year that one million and twenty thousand left the farm last year, the largest number to leave the farms since war-time conditions.

I think the Agricultural Department should continue to show the comparative conditions of agriculture with others, but I feel that they should use the figures in their department that give the actual comparative condition and not adopt figures that are manifestly misleading. We have a condition that must be studied and remedied and all the people of the United States must know that there is an unfair and unequal condition and they should be prepared to grant equality to the people who produce the food and the material for clothing which is, undoubtedly, the most important production in the United States.

If we are to continue to compare price levels, I would like to make a price-level comparison—that of the actual results of my farming experience in Ohio, and the experience of a farmer in Ohio is very much the experience of a farmer in all of the Middle Western States.

I sell corn, oats, hay, milk, hogs, and wheat.

My expenditures are taxes, lumber, paint, fence, tile, and labor.

In selling corn this year I find the price, according to the Department of Agriculture in November, is 73 cents; and the price in the five years preceding the war was 64 cents, which is an increase of 14 per cent.

Now, I sell corn and pay taxes and I find taxes according to the Department of Agriculture have increased 253 per cent. If you will figure that out you will find that I have in paying taxes by selling corn a 45-cent dollar as compared with the situation before the war.

I might add here that the Department of Agriculture in arriving at their index figure eliminates taxes as one of the things the farmer pays or buys. Of course, it would spoil their index figure, but the department does report that farmers are paying in some agricultural States as much as 50 per cent of their net incomes for taxes, so it seems to me that any item that takes that proportion of an income is sufficiently a part of a farmer's expenditure.

The corporations of the country are appealing now to Congress to reduce their income tax which is to-day 13½ per cent and the Congress will comply. Of course, this does not represent all of the taxes paid by corporations, but the corporations of the country have never paid 50 per cent of their income for taxes.

Again, I sell oats and I find, according to the Department of Agriculture, that oats are now selling at 45 cents and did sell at 39 cents for the five-year average before the war, so we are receiving 112 for oats as compared with the prices before the war.

When I sell these oats, I buy lumber and I find the lumber price was \$30 before the war and is now about \$60, so lumber stands at 200. When you figure this out you have a 56-cent dollar when the farmer buys lumber with oats.

Again, I sell hay and the Department of Agriculture says that hay is \$10 per ton in 1927 and \$11 per ton in the five years before the war, so the price of hay is lower now than it was before the war and the farmer has a 90-cent dollar when he sells hay. He buys fencing. We find fencing has gone up from about 38 cents per rod to 62 cents, so that fence is 63 per cent higher than it was before the war. With his 90-cent hay dollar, the farmer buys fencing and when he figures it out he finds he is paying with a 55-cent dollar.

Then I want to paint the building and I sell wheat. According to the Department of Agriculture the price of wheat is \$1.11 and it was 88 cents before the war, so I have a \$1.26 dollar as compared with conditions before the war. I buy oil, white lead, and I find they are higher by 100 per cent than they were before the war, so the farmer finds he has a 63-cent dollar when he exchanges wheat for paint for his building.

Now, I have some milk to sell and I want to tile some land. Milk per hundred pounds before the war was \$1.80 for 4 per cent and last month was \$2.55, and we have in milk a \$1.39 cent dollar. We buy tile with the dollar and we find 4-inch tile before the war cost 25 cents per rod and now 45 cents, or it takes a \$1.80 dollar to buy it.

Therefore when you trade milk for tile you have a 77-cent dollar.

Again, we have hogs to sell. The price before the war was \$7.23, and the price at home to-day is \$8.50, and the hog dollar is therefore a \$1.18 dollar.

We have labor to buy, and the Agriculture Department says that it takes a dollar worth \$1.63 to buy labor.

When you use the hog dollar to buy labor you therefore have a 70-cent dollar. I could go on trading agricultural products for other things the farmers buy—farm machinery, clothing, groceries, and so forth—if I had the figures at my command, and it may be necessary at another time to go into them, but I have compared the principal exchanges, and the value of the dollar used by the farmer is as follows:

The corn dollar exchanged for tax	\$0.45
The oats dollar exchanged for lumber	.56
The hay dollar exchanged for fencing	.55
The wheat dollar exchanged for paint	.63
The milk dollar exchanged for tile	.77
The hog dollar exchanged for labor	.70
	63.66

Average dollar worth.....61

Are these exchanges fairly computed? Would weighting them make any radical change? Would the addition of farm machinery, clothing, gasoline, furniture, and groceries make any material difference?

What becomes of this 92-cent dollar of the Department of Agriculture? My own experience indicates that the northern farmer has a 61-cent dollar and that the price comparison alone is unfair to the farmer, because when he secures a high price he has low production and small actual revenue.

Leaving out labor and taxes, as the Agriculture Department does, does not explain all this discrepancy between 92 and 61 as the value of the farmer's dollar. What else have they subtracted or added? But leaving out all this price comparison, which leads to error, why does the Department of Agriculture not herald to the world that the total revenue of the farmer is twelve billion as against seventy-eight billion for the other groups? Then the country would know why the farmer is trying to be heard. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is not, and I doubt in the circumstances if it could be made, entirely satisfactory to but few if any persons. The bill relates to the settlement of transactions arising during the war more than nine years ago. The long delay in effecting these settlements chiefly accounts for the extremely difficult problems one must face in attempting a belated settlement. The bill presents a sorry situation, a situation which there would doubtless be every disposition to correct or improve were it not for the fact that the only alternative to this bill is probably something worse, although some changes might be made to an advantage. In this situation I feel constrained, without discussing the merits or demerits of the course of our Government since the war in dealing with reparations, to trace and describe that course and policy, and to base my action in voting for the pending bill upon the unavoidable conditions that are presented to us to-day as a direct result of the long failure and delay of our Government to take seasonable and effective steps to settle these claims. I shall therefore repeat in substance what I have said on a former occasion, the history of the general repara-

tions problem since 1918 and the strange course of nonaction and delay on the part of our Government in connection therewith.

The Reparation Commission was organized in 1919 by the delegates to the Versailles Peace Conference. The relation of the United States to reparations has always been unofficial. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Albert Rathbone was instructed to attend the meetings from December, 1919, to the spring of 1920, when R. W. Boyden succeeded him until February 19, 1921, when, as a courtesy to the incoming Republican administration, he was withdrawn. In May, 1921, Boyden was instructed by Secretary Hughes to sit again unofficially on reparation commission. He was succeeded by James A. Logan August 1, 1923. On October 15, 1923, Secretary Hughes notified the allied governments that the United States could only take part in the conference on German reparations, provided the conference should be merely advisory and that the United States could not appoint a member of the Reparation Commission since such appointment could not be made without the consent of Congress. In other words, the United States could not officially participate in the proceedings of the Reparation Commission. Again, on December 12, the United States turned down another invitation to participate officially in the proposed work of the Reparation Commission. The separate Berlin treaty contained a Senate reservation prohibiting the United States from being represented on the Reparation Commission without consent of Congress. President Harding in a letter to Senator Lodge on December 27, 1922, urged the removal of this prohibition, but no action was taken. Secretary Hughes on October 15, 1923, suggested that competent American citizens would be willing to participate in an economic inquiry relating to the balancing of the German budget, measures to be taken to stabilize her currency, and the further development of the reparation problem.

The first suggestion on this general subject culminated in an agreement for the appointment of the so-called Dawes committee of experts on November 30, 1923. This committee met at Paris January 14, 1924. The Dawes committee made its report to the Reparation Commission April 9, 1924. This report was accepted by the Reparation Commission as a suitable basis for a new solution of the reparations problem. The London reparation conference convened July 16, 1924, to consider the Dawes report, and out of it to develop a modified reparations plan. This meeting was successful and adjourned on August 30 following. The United States sent delegates to the London conference, but "with strictly limited powers." Frank B. Kellogg, ambassador to London, on July 16 stated that—

we do not come in the same capacity, with the same powers, as the other delegates, because we are not parties to the Versailles treaty or the sanctions now in force, etc.

The American delegates, therefore, refrained from signing the final act of the London conference on August 16, 1924.

The Paris conference was held January 7 to 14, 1925, to agree upon and allocate to the allied governments their respective shares of German reparations under the Dawes plan. American delegates participated in the Paris conference. Secretary Kellogg, in a letter dated August 5, 1924, announced that—

in view of the fact that the purpose of this conference will include the question of the allocation of German payments since January 1, 1923, etc., the United States should be represented.

The Paris conference resulted in an agreement between all the allied governments and the United States relative to the distribution of the German reparations to each Government in the future. The Dawes plan as adopted by the London conference provided, among other things, that—

the payments made by Germany are to comprise all amounts for which Germany may be liable to the allied and associated powers for the costs arising out of the war, including reparation, restitution, clearing-house operations, etc.

In other words, all charges payable by Germany to the allied and associated powers for these war costs. This included the United States. It was due to this agreement that the United States was cut off from receiving any payments from Germany for any purpose under the separate Berlin treaty between our Government and Germany, but all payments that might be received could only come out of reparations provided for by the Dawes Commission. It was in these circumstances that the United States, speaking through Ambassador Kellogg, hastened to request permission to sit for the first time as a full-fledged delegate in the Paris conference convened to allocate reparations to the allied governments under the Dawes plan. The final

outcome was that the United States was allowed out of the Dawes annuities 55,000,000 gold marks per annum, beginning September 21, 1926, in payment of the costs of our Army occupation in Germany after the war, or from November 11, 1918, to the date of withdrawal of our army of occupation on January 24, 1923. The American delegates to the Paris conference were so afraid of becoming "involved" even in the single problem of associating with the allied governments in collecting reparations that they strenuously protested against signing the full Paris agreement. When they discovered that America would get nothing under the Dawes plan unless they did sign the entire agreement, they proceeded to do so. This agreement was dated January 14, 1925. At this time the American debt against Germany for Army occupation was around \$255,000,000 and the estimated debts due American nationals was \$350,000,000. The pittance allowed for these estimated amounts under the Dawes plan would not pay interest, much less any part of the principal. The figures as to claims of American nationals, however, have been reduced so that the allowance of 2½ per cent would pay off these claims within 60 to 80 years. This is the kind and character of settlement that our Government made with respect to the payment of these two debts against Germany in January, 1925, more than six years after the armistice. To the past year not one dollar had accrued to our Government either in payment of Army occupation debt or American claims, save the amount just recited and certain small amounts in the nature of requisitions made by our Army in Germany under the Rhineland agreement, which the allied governments had placed in operation.

It is important to contrast the steps of the allied governments taken during all the years prior to 1925 to collect from Germany their Army occupation costs and claims of their respective nationals, while the American Government was pursuing its chosen policy of utter inaction, aloofness, and isolation, even with respect to the operations of the allied Reparation Commission, dealing alone with the question of collecting money due from Germany for war costs. In the first place, the Allies collected for themselves from Germany during the period prior to June 30, 1923, in cash and in kind, the sum of \$1,280,000,000 through the Reparation Commission. The United States having failed to ratify the treaty of peace with Germany of June 28, 1919, proceeded on August 25, 1921, to negotiate a separate treaty of peace with Germany. This treaty proposed to give the United States all rights, privileges, indemnities, or advantages stipulated for the benefit of the United States in the treaty of Versailles. Article 2 of that treaty specified among other rights accruing to the United States should be those under parts 8, 9, and 10 of the treaty of Versailles, relating, respectively, to reparation, financial, and economic matters. These included claims of our nationals. The treaty of Versailles provided that the costs of the armies of occupation should be the first charge upon reparations. The United States, however, having made a separate treaty with Germany, which was designed to enable the United States, acting separately from the allied governments, and individually, to collect from Germany direct her Army costs and the claims of her nationals, the allied governments proceeded to demand and receive the chief portion of their army costs, which were accordingly paid through the Reparation Commission; but America, failing either to request or to accept payment through this agency, received nothing, not even direct from Germany, as the Berlin treaty contemplated.

During the years 1919 to 1925 the allied governments, acting under articles 296 and 297 of the treaty of Versailles, which provided for the liquidation of debts of the nationals of either side due to the nationals of the other, proceeded to set up clearing offices for handling these mutual claims and arbitral tribunals for matters involving questions of law. These clearing offices functioned for more than five years and settled the majority of the claims. When the value of Germany's claims did not offset that of the creditor States, Germany made special monthly payments to balance the clearing-office accounts. The United States refusing to avail itself of the clearing-office system, did not, of course, have any claims of this character disposed of and has not to this day collected and paid to our nationals a penny of their claims against Germany. It, of course, is true that 2½ per cent of the Dawes annuities commenced in the first year of the Dawes plan, September 1, 1924, to August 31, 1925. It is also true that in an effort to pursue relations direct with Germany under our separate Berlin treaty, and hence not to look to the Reparation Commission or to avail ourselves of the clearing-office system, our Government did, on August 10, 1922, effect an agreement with Germany for a Mixed Claims Commission to determine the amount to be paid by Germany on account of our nationals and our Government from

the German Government and German nationals. That commission has not even yet concluded its work. The allied governments, on the other hand, proceeded with dispatch to collect from Germany vast amounts both on account of army occupation and debts due their nationals while Germany was able and in a humor to pay.

It is remarkably strange that although the allied governments during the years following our separate Berlin treaty were constantly inviting the American Government to participate in the work of the Reparation Commission, thereby utilizing both the Berlin treaty and the Reparation Commission as agencies through which to secure payments for Army expenses and on claims of our nationals. The inevitable result was that until 1925 our Government failed to realize a penny on any obligation by Germany, either under the Berlin treaty or through the Allied Reparation Commission. These facts strikingly reveal how and why American rights and claims are to-day unpaid in whole or in part.

The general result of our course left our Government in the position, finally, of an agreement with Germany that the property of her nationals seized by our Government should be retained as security for debts due our Government and nationals or until such debts were discharged, while at the same time we were later forced to become parties to the Paris agreement, under the Dawes plan, which would require the German Government 80 years to pay obligations to our nationals. This conflicting situation imperatively required our Government either to confiscate German property held by the Alien Property Custodian or provide for its release within a far shorter period than 80 years, the time necessary for payment of the American claimants. It was this course and these conditions resulting which have rendered it impossible for our Government now to make a really satisfactory adjustment pro or con of indebtedness between our Government and Germany and our nationals and German nationals. In point of fact, the Dawes plan requires our Government to turn back as a credit on our annuities under the Dawes plan any excess or final balance, or, in fact, any property finally retained by our Government must be credited on the annuities of the Dawes Commission otherwise due us.

It seems that our Government, in the spring of 1923, for the first time awakened to the fact that neither the debts for Army occupation nor those due our nationals might ever be paid separately and directly under the Berlin treaty. It was decided, therefore, to send Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Wadsworth to Europe to secure, if possible, an agreement for payment of Army costs as specially provided by the armistice agreement. This Army cost agreement was negotiated on May 25, 1923, but was never ratified by France, although Belgium, in the meantime, had deposited 62,500,000 gold marks in New York to be turned over to the American Government whenever France ratified the agreement, which she never did. Our Government declined to accept payment in kind at any time. The fact that the Allies did accept payments in kind to a measurable extent greatly aided in balancing off and settling indebtedness between them and their nationals and Germany under articles 296 and 297 of the treaty of Versailles.

It seems that Ambassador Kellogg in his letter of August 5, 1924, not only sought to have America represented in the Paris conference later to be held, but also sought an understanding to the effect that the right of the United States to share in reparation distributions for debts due our nationals as well as Army costs should be recognized, and that this gave rise to an extended debate in the plenary meeting of August 12. This controversy appears also to have been renewed at the outset of the Paris conference. It was charged by the British representative that the United States had several times been requested to present a detailed schedule of the claims of our nationals in order that the allied experts could examine them, "but this request has not been acceded to." The American expert contended that he had formerly raised the question of the participation of the United States in the plan annuities, although it was admittedly at a belated stage. The facts seem to warrant the conclusion that the unratified Wadsworth Army cost agreement of May 25, 1923, was recast at the instance of the United States Government as a condition precedent to the allowance of the 2½ per cent annuity for the payment of American nationals under the Dawes plan. Under the Wadsworth plan our Army debt was payable in 12 annual installments, or \$21,000,000 per year. In order, therefore, to secure any share of the Dawes annuities with which to pay any part of the claims of our nationals, it was agreed that the payment of our Army cost should be 55,000,000 gold marks per annum, or about \$13,000,000, and extending over a period of nearly 20 years. It was only then that the 2½ per cent was squeezed through the Paris conference as a last-minute and very grudging concession. The United States, therefore, secured nearly

\$23,000,000 of the total annual amount of German reparations when they become payable in full of \$25,000,000. To the stage of the Paris conference, or from November 11, 1918, to February 28, 1925, the total amount of German reparation payments of every kind aggregated \$2,250,000,000, not including income from the Ruhr occupation amounting to near \$300,000,000.

The question has been asked whether the Paris agreement surrendered or modified any treaty right of the United States or in any way limited the amount of the claims of the United States. It is true that no treaty right nor the amount of the claims of the United States was limited or modified by the Paris agreement, but the opportunity or chance for securing payment of American claims was tremendously limited. It is true that in the event the Dawes plan of reparations should break down, all unpaid American claims and debts would stand intact against Germany. It is equally true that they would no more be collectible from Germany under our separate Berlin treaty than they were collectible under this treaty from 1921 to 1925. It is greatly surprising that our Government negotiated and entered into the separate treaty of Berlin upon the assumption and belief that we could secure payment for debts due our Government and our nationals direct from Germany under the Berlin treaty. It is even more surprising that our Government did not awake from this patent delusion until 1924 when, in the language of Secretary Kellogg, "it was believed that participation in payment under the Dawes plan would be advantageous to the United States." This fatal lapse on the part of our Government during these years accounts for our present predicament in attempting to deal with the American and German debt situation. We lose as a result all interest on our Army cost bill of \$240,000,000 principal. Assuming that the principal will be ultimately paid, the interest loss to our Government will aggregate much over \$100,000,000. Long delay and substantial losses have also been suffered by American claimants. Let me make more clear the conclusions just stated. America embraced and ratified the Berlin treaty upon the plea, among others, that according to article 1 the United States should enjoy "all the rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages, and so forth, stipulated for the benefit of the United States in the treaty of Versailles, which the United States shall fully enjoy notwithstanding the fact that such treaty has not been ratified by the United States."

The allied governments, when the United States sought to participate in the London and Paris conferences for the purpose of securing payment of amounts due from Germany, called attention to article 248 of the Versailles treaty by which Germany "constituted the reparation obligations the first charge upon all her assets," and that she could not, therefore, legally acknowledge any new obligations to a separate government which had not ratified the Versailles treaty. Attention was further called to the terms of the treaty of Versailles to the effect that the amount of damage for which compensation was to be made by Germany should be left to the Reparation Commission. The fact should be kept in mind that the original Reparation Commission of 1919 is still alive and functioning. The allied governments also insisted in this connection that at no time prior to the London conference in 1924 did the American Government offer the slightest hint or suggestion to the Reparation Commission of any claim against Germany which it was desired to have paid through the Reparation Commission. To the further contention of the United States that nothing in the Versailles treaty prohibited or incapacitated Germany from making separate and direct settlements with and payments to the United States, the allied governments again emphasized article 248 of the treaty of Versailles, and insisted that according to the terms of this treaty the assessment of the reparation claims of the Allies is the exclusive business of the Reparation Commission, and that it is a "general controlling agency set up by the treaty with jurisdiction over all the reparation claims of the powers contracting with Germany," and so forth; that the Reparation Commission both before and after the Dawes plan has sought to collect off Germany to the limit of her ability to pay. The allied governments made the final reply that "one or more of the allied and associated powers could properly make a separate agreement" relative to the payment of its own claim, but that when a joint treaty in behalf of 25 associated powers and creditors has been negotiated and entered into, it would not be justifiable for a single associated power to undertake to enter into a separate treaty with provisions that would deprive the other 25 creditor nations of German payments contemplated by the joint treaty previously entered into with the knowledge of all nations. At least some notice and some understanding with the 25 joint creditor countries was necessary at the time the separate treaty was made. In other words, when 25 creditors adopt a plan of dealing with the assets of a debtor, it is doubtful whether a twenty-sixth creditor may later proceed to

deal with the assets as though the 25 creditors and their previous arrangement were not in existence. Some sort of concert is naturally necessary and logical.

I have sought briefly to detail the substance of the conflicting views of our Government and those of the allied governments as they have related to the course of the American Government in dealing with our claims against Germany for Army costs and for our nationals. Without expressing definite opinions relative to the merits of these international discussions, it does seem that our Government at least was driven to the resort of invoking "all defenses." At any rate, our Government was overwhelmingly overruled and somewhat sheepishly abided the decision. While it is true that our indebtedness against Germany will stand intact in the event the Dawes plan should fail, it has been demonstrated also to be true that any payments thereafter made to us by Germany would come through the Reparation Commission and not direct under the Berlin treaty. In addition to the losses I have already pointed out due to the failure of this Government to keep in touch with the Reparation Commission prior to 1925, our Government must now take the position of a deferred creditor with possible payments far in the future, even if the provisions of the pending bill are carried out. I shall as the only possible way out of an extremely bad situation vote for the pending bill, but I shall never be able to excuse the obtuseness and unpardonable negligence of our Government in handling its claims and the claims of its nationals. In the grossly unsatisfactory and now impossible situation, we can only charge off to profit and loss more than \$100,000,000 interest on German debt for Army occupation, and later charge off likewise such portions of the debt of \$60,000,000, with interest, due our Government and payable after 25 years, which may not then be paid. Such losses will of course constitute a penalty which our people must pay on account of our Government's policy of delay, inaction, and aloofness since the war. I say this because the only alternatives to the passage of some such bill as this, which makes the Government a long-deferred creditor, would be to confiscate the property of the German nationals we hold, or make individual claimants the long-deferred creditors rather than the Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, as evidence that there is a widespread belief upon the part of a very large body of our citizens that they are denied the equal rights guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States, I wish to read the petition of the National Equal Rights League and Race Congress on behalf of the colored citizens of the United States for the enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is as follows:

To Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States:

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787, held for the purpose of creating a "more perfect Union," the question of perpetuating the institution of slavery was the cause of acrimonious debate therein. So heated, indeed, became this controversy between those who were for and those who were against the system of slavery that two compromises upon this issue had to be reached before agreement upon the Constitution could be attained.

George Mason, of Virginia, a delegate to the convention, urged the abolition of slavery, and stated that unless the institution was abolished a war between the northern and southern sections of the United States would ensue—the clash of opposing sectional interests could terminate in no other way. This prophet found himself without honor in his own land and walked out of the convention, refusing to affix his signature to the instrument as finally adopted.

From 1787 to 1861 the history of the United States discloses the truth that moral issues dodged, no matter how deftly, will one day strike with crushing force.

Slavery was abolished on the battle fields of the Republic, but in its wake there followed peonage, disfranchisement, lynching, civil and political disabilities imposed upon the people who had just escaped from age-long bondage.

After the passage of 60 years we find colored Americans victimized in many parts of the land, and especially in the South, by the same evil forces of arrogance and hate which had held them so long in slavery with the aid of governments, both State and Federal.

Fortunately the great leaders of the Nation, at the close of the Civil War, so amended the Constitution as to make it square with the Declaration of Independence and the principles of free, democratic government, and under the amended instrument Congress was empowered to enforce these new articles wherever and whenever they should be violated.

We therefore most respectfully invite the attention of Congress to the fact that colored American citizens have been deprived of the right to vote by laws enacted and State constitutions adopted. Cunningly worded statutes were devised to accomplish this purpose, so that, if

possible, these regulations might be held to conform to the amended Constitution.

Much success has thus far attended the efforts of reactionary communities to rob colored American citizens of the right to vote upon terms of equality with their white fellow citizens, but the immediate penalty paid by such communities has been to find themselves pushed backward into the least progressive communities of the land. They have fallen behind economically, educationally, and represent politically ideas which have brought and are continuing to bring in many parts of the world upheaval and revolution. They are not only not abreast of the best American thought, but their hideous reaction has given birth to a lawless organization now engaged in spreading corruption and terror in wide sections of our country.

The failure of the Federal Government to carry out the provisions of the Constitution, which guarantees republican forms of government to every State within the Union, has resulted in lawlessness on such a widespread scale that even southern officials are becoming alarmed over the situation, and are so expressing themselves.

When white women as well as men are being whipped and maimed by a nationally organized band of disguised things, we have a perfect demonstration of the extent to which lawlessness will go, from its black to its white victims, when once it is allowed to take firm root.

Another moral issue now faces the constituted authorities of the land. Will it be met or will it be dodged, as was the slavery issue?

We most respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to carry out its sworn obligation, to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, to the end that the rights of all citizens may be secured under republican forms of government. The Constitution provides the way.

We most respectfully urge upon Congress increased Federal aid to southern education, passage of the Dyer antilynching bill, a law-making segregation of colored employees of the Federal civil service a statutory offense, enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, to the end that disfranchisement and racial segregation upon common carriers shall be abolished.

GEORGE FRAZIER MILLER, *New York, President*

National Equal Rights League and Race Congress.

W. H. JERNAGIN, *Vice President at Large.*

MAURICE W. SPENCER, *Vice President.*

HALLEY B. TAYLOR, *Chaplain.*

H. T. MEDFORD, *Vice President.*

WM. MUNROE TROTTER, *Secretary.*

J. H. RANDOLPH, *Assistant Corresponding Secretary.*

THOMAS H. R. CLARKE, *Chairman Petitions Committee.*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, on general principles I do not advocate Government ownership or Government operation of industries. In the first place, such operation is generally both extravagant and inefficient. In the second place, the citizen hardly gets a fair deal when the Government comes into competition with him in some line of enterprise, and then collects taxes from him to establish and maintain this competition. Such a policy if generally pursued by the Government would tend both to destroy private initiative and to dry up the streams of public revenue. In spite of these views, however, I have revised and reintroduced my bill for at least indirect and temporary Government operation of Muscle Shoals.

I say "indirect," because the bill provides for a Government corporation rather than direct management through some Federal department; and "temporary," because the life of this corporation is fixed at only 10 years. So the Congress may perpetuate this plan or arrange for private control as may seem wise after the proposed scheme has been sufficiently tested.

For these years the Congress has been trying in vain to arrive at some conclusion as to what should be done with the Muscle Shoals enterprise. The plant looks like a great public asset, and I trust that it will finally prove such. Yet so far it has been only a problem and a burden. We have hesitated about Government operation and yet we have been unable to secure a bid for private operation upon which we could agree. Certainly these conditions should not continue longer.

The chief trouble seems to be that nobody is prepared to take hold of this business with full confidence or certainty. Neither the Congress nor the business organizations of the country have sufficient experience of such a plant to enter with full assurance into a contract for its permanent operation.

The Government has spent huge sums of money upon the enterprise, and large sums will yet be needed to get it to working at full capacity. Government management may be or may not be the final solution of the problem, but our experience so far convinces me that the Government would for the present best keep the property in hand and operate it at least through the experimental stage.

The original purpose of the Muscle Shoals development was to provide explosives for the use of the Army and Navy in times

of war and fertilizer for agriculture in times of peace. Later there has come into the problem the very large question of hydroelectric power to be used in public utility and for industrial and commercial development. This great enterprise therefore concerns especially three phases of our country's welfare—agriculture, national defense, and commerce and industry. Therefore in framing my bill I have provided that the operation of Muscle Shoals should be directed by a Government corporation of which the three directors should be the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Commerce. The immediate management of the business is to be in the hands of a general superintendent selected by the directors with two assistants selected by the general superintendent. One of these assistants must be a man of information and experience in the fixation of nitrogen and the production of nitrogenous materials, and the other an expert on hydroelectric power.

I have intentionally provided that the directors shall have large powers and broad latitude, because I am sure that they will need that if they successfully meet the conditions and work out the problems.

The plan proposed contains a very vital provision for national defense and a provision for very large industrial and commercial development through the production and distribution of power. Yet I should say that in its finality it is a farm-relief measure. The production and distribution of fertilizer and the consequent relief of agriculture are made primary; and any net profits derived from the sale of power are to be used for production of fertilizer and improvement of soils.

I invite my colleagues to read this bill carefully, and I presume to believe that you will find its provisions worthy of very careful consideration. The bill was introduced to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would not ordinarily at this time in the evening ask your indulgence, because I know it is rather trying after a day's session to expect the few gentlemen who are always on guard to listen to one to whom you have listened probably many times on unimportant subjects, but flood control is of paramount importance to any Member representing a district from that section, and particularly to those born and bred in that section. What I am going to say might not appear strictly relevant to the discussion of this bill under consideration, but I think it has some bearing upon it. I have heard several gentlemen here discuss this bill from the same standpoint, that the funding bill was so generally and so ably and adroitly considered and discussed last year and two years ago. Capacity to pay was the outstanding feature of almost every speech and with each gentleman was the controlling factor of the main point in every speech, and all the changes were rung upon it in the consideration of the funding of the debts due us by European nations—the capacity to pay. I believe that is a correct doctrine. At any rate I have no fault to find with it. I am going to vote for this bill. I believe it is a proper thing, as the American attitude, to vote for a bill of this kind in order to preserve our national prestige and in order to maintain our traditions. I voted for all the debt bills logically based upon the capacity of the peoples involved to pay. I know our country is generously disposed to European nations, and I believe when those people are in affliction or sorrow or financial distress that our people and our country, our Government, should be generously inclined. That is a duty we owe to humanity, and as long as we remain a free, liberty-loving, fine people we will continue to dream and do noble things and discharge the moral obligations we owe the world and mankind. Not only do we discharge very generously our obligations to the alien beyond the seas, but we legislate benignly for the well to do, the rich, the opulent, the powerful, as is evidenced in the several tax reduction bills passed since the termination of the war. We have made a reduction when there was no general demand for it. The bill passed yesterday was not very popularly demanded by the people of the United States. I do not think they paid much attention to it. But I voted for that bill, even while recognizing that its main provisions practically brought about a reduction of \$274,000,000, which was in the nature of a gift to the corporations, for the bill remits a tax which had already been collected, as it was made a part of the price of the goods sold by the corporations.

In other words, instead of applying the reduction to 1928 and subsequent incomes it is retroactive and includes 1927 incomes. Now, this generous and overgenerous disposition may be all right. But I have always thought that charity and re-

lated sentiments should not only begin at home but always be applied when and where most needed. The thing that has always occurred to me as one of the inexplicable characteristics of the American people is that they hesitate to deal as generously with their own when in absolute distress, but who do not want to solicit charity, believing that if granted the relief which they think they are entitled to that they would be able to stand erect and work out their own salvation by their toil and patience as they unfailingly and emotionally do by the stranger and the kinsman who does not need the helping hand. I know we get up a Red Cross movement very quickly when any disaster suggests, but these are temporary impulses that soon pass away. What I mean is that as a general thing there is more national concern over the misfortunes of other nationals than any disposition to recognize a great national obligation to an immense section of our own country, such as the Mississippi Valley, where dwell millions and millions of our own—our American countrymen, our kith and kin, blood of our blood, and bone of our bone. Read the refunding bills and the legislative literature on those bills and then read up to this moment the written word by the administrative branch of the Government. Render unto Caesar at home and abroad all that is due unto Caesar. If I thought it would promote the welfare of the world and make mankind a little more happy, a little more contented, and I had the power, I would cancel all of the debts due us. I would give industry and commerce every chance and opportunity to give vast permanent employment to our toilers, our working people in factory and foundry, in field, on the farms, and in the mines by removing every tax that might slow up the wheels of prosperity; all of which brings me back to a repetition of what I have already said, and that is that we are in many respects a most generous people, particularly to those we owe the least, while with our kinswomen and kinsmen, people who have been struggling for many, many years to keep up their civilization in spite of tremendous difficulties—war, famine, disease, disaster, the breaking of the Mississippi River levees—we find a disposition to be most exacting.

That is illustrated by the engineers' report recently made with reference to the proposed flood control and the President's message on the subject. I wish to say now, with all the deference that it is possible for me to express the thought in, that the attitude of the President of the United States could be more generous under all the circumstances without even in the slightest or remotest way impinging or violating any economic or governmental principle or well-established policy. And it is our hope that upon a further reflection of a matter that I know has been one of gravest concern to him, that he will realize that we of the valley have nothing to contribute.

What is the use, my friends, of submitting a proposition legislatively to a people who can not meet the conditions? What is the use of asking the people of that section, broken on the wheel of adversity, bowed down in their grief, prostrate, and absolutely ruined, to make a contribution of 20 per cent, which, after all, does not represent the exact contribution they have to make? It is almost adding insult to injury. It is laughing at them in their woe to ask them for money which they have not got, something that it is impossible for them to secure. In my judgment it is not treating the matter as solemnly as it should be treated.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. COLLIER. I recently read in an editorial in one of the large newspapers of the country—I forget which one of them, now—in which they seemed to treat 20 per cent as the maximum contribution, and, in fact, all the contributions that those people would make. As the gentleman from Louisiana has the floor, will he tell us how much more they have to make in buying lots and turning that property over to the Government for the purpose of flood control?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Yes; 20 per cent, my friends, is really the minimum. I was born and reared behind the banks of the Mississippi River. I have witnessed many crevasses. Like all those to the manner born, I have never been in terror of a break in the river bank, though I know that a crevasse is not a trifling thing. Our people will continue to live where they were born and reared, regardless of river danger. And when you reflect upon the peculiarities of human nature and consider that men and women have lived on the slopes of Vesuvius and Etna during all the ages, notwithstanding the volcanic eruptions which always threaten, and have gone back and resumed their habitations after every catastrophe, it is no great matter for wonderment that our own people want to struggle back to their homes behind the levees after a flood, however disastrous it might have been.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman kindly let me have five minutes more?

Mr. COLLIER. Subject to the approval of the gentleman from Iowa, I will agree to give the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Our people have done so repeatedly and will continue to do so, and dwell along the banks of the Mississippi River because it is home, which means and says it all. But I want to answer the point raised by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER]. Twenty per cent is the minimum that it will cost to try to live up to that report, and that is an impossible condition. Why should not the Government bear the full cost of acquiring and operating spillways? If the engineers had recommended exclusively larger and stronger levees, I do not think the recommendations would be taken seriously by the House, because it is entirely logical and it appeals to your sense of reason that if you raised the levees and restricted the waters within them the result would be in the nature of a dam and would not have been different from the plan the engineers have been following for 40 years. During my lifetime I have seen reclaimed practically 20,000 square miles of that area which were formerly reservoirs of the great river. The White River, the St. Francis, the Yazoo, and the Tensas Basins were once the great natural storage reservoirs for the Father of Waters.

I believe in one of the recent magazine issues of the Isaak Walton League it is stated that 20,000 additional miles were taken up and reclaimed of a once swampy and alluvial nature soil and made habitable. It is these tremendous reclamations that have done a whole lot in bringing us into the perilous position we are in to-day. I repeat, and I can not repeat it too often, the spillway sites should be paid for by the General Government.

Now, gentlemen, I would like, if you would give me your attention, to speak for a few moments on that angle or slant of the flood problem, because it is all important. As I say, if the proposition were brought before the House just simply to enlarge the levees, I do not think it would take the country by storm, for it would simply be an enlargement of the present situation, and, what is more, the subsoil of Louisiana would not permit of much larger levees.

Without the spillway site, which, in my judgment, is sine qua non and absolutely essential in order to make for the success of the new plan, we might as well not legislate on the plan. Therefore the spillways, being a part of the whole system and being for the benefit of the whole river, should be considered a part of it and should not be looked upon merely as a local proposition, for our people in Louisiana and the people of Louisiana be expected to furnish that site and devote a tremendous area to the carrying off of the waters that pour down upon us from 34 States of the Union. I want to get that to Mr. TILSON and Mr. LONGWORTH, who are doing me the honor to listen to me, because probably that obvious observation may not have occurred to them. Sometimes we do not look at our feet because we are busy looking at the horizon. That struck me as being important and that a higher levee system would not mean much, and I do not know that you could get it through the House at the expense involved without spillways and outlets. And that is the only logical way to take the water out of the river before it strikes and drowns us as a result of an accumulated volume that will not suffer restraint.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means by spillways not only the site where it leaves the main river but the entire land that would be covered by these overflows? That is what the gentleman means by spillways?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Yes; all of the land covered by these overflows through what is known as a spillway.

Mr. TILSON. And the gentleman's idea is that that should be paid for as a part of the expense, the same as the levees?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I think so.

Mr. TILSON. Then to whom would this land belong?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. To the National Government. There should be national responsibility in toto. I do not think the States or local communities ought to have anything to do about it, because it is a national proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. TILSON. In these spillways there would be a considerable territory that would be covered by water in time of flood.

To whom would these lands belong and who would use the lands during the years when there are no floods?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. They would belong exclusively to the National Government.

Mr. TILSON. They would lie fallow and not be cultivated?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I do not think we can have a divided responsibility or a divided ownership with the States or localities. It is a national responsibility, a national obligation, and there can not be divided ownership. Divided ownership simply means the confusion that has followed up to this time. If it is a national obligation the country ought to discharge that obligation exclusively, and the States should not be permitted to have anything to say about the manner in which that discharge should be made. I want to thank the gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7201) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany and of German nationals against the United States, for the ultimate return of all property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian, and for the equitable apportionment among all claimants of certain available funds, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 19, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, December 17, 1927, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(9 a. m.)

Interior Department appropriation bill.

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

(Caucus room)

To hear William P. Wooten, chairman of the spillways board and members of the Mississippi River Commission, discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

Monday, December 19, 1927

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended (to include within the act "live poultry" wherever the term "livestock" is used) (H. J. Res. 85).

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

To discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes (H. R. 5641).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the sale of surplus War Department real estate (H. R. 86).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Admiral Magruder.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

234. A letter from the chairman of the United States Board of Tax Appeals, transmitting report of publications issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, by the United States Board of Tax Appeals; to the Committee on Printing.

235. A letter from the Public Printer of the United States Government Printing Office, transmitting report that from January 5 to December 13, 1927, 8,832 pounds of useless papers were sold as waste, and the proceeds, \$39.74, deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

236. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill, "Authorizing custodians of Federal buildings to administer oaths of office to employees in the custodian service"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

237. A letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting report, accompanied by exhibits, briefs, maps, etc., pursuant to "An act authorizing negotiations for the acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

238. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled 'An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve'"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

239. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill "To amend section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the equalization of promotion of officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy with officers of the line,' approved June 10, 1926"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

240. A report from the Temporary Committee on Accounts, pursuant to House Resolution 453, Sixty-ninth Congress, adopted March 3, 1927, transmitting report to the House concerning the abolishing of useless offices and what adjustments, if any, should be made in the employment, duties, and compensation of the officers and employees of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1589. A bill for the relief of John J. Waters; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1590. A bill to correct the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker and Calton C. Baker or Carlton C. Baker is one and the same person; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4707. A bill for the relief of Calvin H. Burkhead; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 431) to authorize the payment of certain taxes to Okanogan County, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 491) authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 812) for the relief of Kratzer Carriage Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 1030) for the relief of the Rochester Country Club, Rochester, Ind.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 1975) for the relief of the State hospital of the State of Florida; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of J. C. McConnell; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2134) to extend the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 22, 1920, entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," to Lon Snapp; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of Annie McColgan; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2426) for the relief of Francis A. Grennen; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Morris Dietrich; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2943) for the relief of the African-American Importing Co. (Inc.) of New York City, N. Y.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of the Burt Wool & Leather Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3740) for the relief of Homer J. Williamson; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3945) for the relief of Compere & Wyatt; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of the estate of Alvin C. Laupheimer; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4028) for the relief of Lewis C. Hopkins & Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4045) for the relief of the Alaska Products Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4097) for the relief of the McGilvray-Raymond Granite Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4445) to refund to Kramp & Gaskill income tax erroneously and illegally collected; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4503) for the relief of the Cudahy Packing Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of Raphael Levy; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of A. L. Jacobs; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4658) for the relief of M. F. Powers; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4659) for the relief of Alice Hackney; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5293) for the relief of Horton B. Herrin; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5317) for the relief of Addie Belle Smith; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5376) for the relief of Alfred A. Winslow; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5417) granting an increase of pension to Laura O'Dwyer; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5930) for the relief of Jesse W. Boisseau; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5974) for the relief of Whitney Supply Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 5976) for the relief of the heirs of Gen. Dick Taylor; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5990) for the relief of the Guamoco Mining Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 6183) to reimburse W. B. Donelson for revenues wrongfully paid; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 6360) for the relief of Edward S. Lathrop; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6361) for the relief of Frank Rizzuto; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6368) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to refund to the Farmers' Grain Co., of Omaha, Nebr., income taxes illegally paid to the United States Treasurer; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 6388) for the relief of Ruth Gore; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6551) for the relief of H. A. Griffith; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of the estate of William Bardel; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 7723) to increase the pay of the officers and members of the Fire Department and of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7724) giving preference to American materials and equipment in highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 7725) granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware & New Jersey Bridge Corporation, a corporation of the State of Delaware, domiciled at Wilmington, Del., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 7726) for the improvement of Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORIN. A bill (H. R. 7727) to amend section 47d of the national defense act, as amended, so as to authorize employment of hostesses for temporary duty at citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7728) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the city of Buhl, Twin Falls County, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7729) to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 7730) to create an additional judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7731) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Batesville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7732) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Lawrenceburg, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7733) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Aurora, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7734) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Franklin, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7735) for the erection of a public building in Greensburg, State of Indiana, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 7736) to amend Penal Code of the United States as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 7737) to provide for the authorization of appropriation for the purchase of sites and the erection of Federal buildings at various cities in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7738) to encourage the development of the agriculture resources of the United States and the establishment of rural homes through Federal and States cooperation, giving preference in the matter of employment and the establishment of such homes to those who have served with the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7739) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to create the farmers' finance corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) to authorize the construction of a memorial statue in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) to authorize the construction of jetties and other works necessary to stop and prevent erosions of the shore line of Jekyll and St. Simons Islands, in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 7742) to amend an act providing for the restoration of Fort McHenry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) to increase the efficiency of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOWREY: A bill (H. R. 7744) to provide for the national defense and to aid agricultural and industrial development by creating the United States Muscle Shoals Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7745) granting the consent of Congress to the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7746) to authorize the erection of a monument on the battle field of Saratoga; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 7747) to regulate the manufacture, printing, and sale of envelopes with postage stamps embossed thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 7748) to authorize appropriations to be made for the disposition of remains of military personnel and civilian employees of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7749) to regulate the appointment and duties of the superintendent of the Antietam battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7750) to restrict expenditures from the annual appropriations for the Organized Reserves, except for medical officers and nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7751) to authorize the free issue of surplus or reserve uniforms and other equipment or material to the citizens' military training camps and to limit the cost of stocks furnished by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7752) to limit the issue of reserve supplies or equipment held by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7753) to authorize the disbursement of an accounting for the appropriation "Pay, etc., of the Army," as one fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7754) to prevent the use of a stop watch or time-measuring device, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7755) to restrict expenditures from the appropriation "Military supplies and equipment for schools and colleges"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7756) to authorize the purchase of options on materials for engineer operations and temporary construction at camps, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7757) to authorize reimbursement of travel expenses of officers for instruction purposes in connection with the Engineer School; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7758) to authorize the employment of consulting engineers for the Air Corps and the Ordnance Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 7759) to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) providing for the completing of Dam No. 2 and the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, for the manufacture and distribution of fertilizer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHAFER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) appointing William Mitchell, of Wisconsin, a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to provide that the United States extend to the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses an invitation to hold the sixth session of the association in the United States, and for the expenses thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) to provide for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Second Pan American Conference on Highways at Rio de Janeiro; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 109) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a statue of Oscar S. Straus in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 110) to reimburse Susan Sanders for expenses and services rendered in behalf of the Eastern, Emigrant, and Western Cherokees by blood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARENTZ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) directing the Comptroller General of the United States to reopen, readjust, and resettle the account between the State of Nevada and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 59) relating to officers and employees and services of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7700) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 7761) granting an increase of pension to Mary Schoske; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7762) granting an increase of pension to Maria Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7763) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta C. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7764) granting a pension to Agnes Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 7765) granting an increase of pension to Julia Burkard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Dudrow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7767) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda A. Fortney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7768) granting an increase of pension to Ethel L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7769) granting a pension to Nancy Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 7770) for the relief of Edward Beebe, alias Edward Coyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 7771) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hanchett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7772) for the relief of Frank Schultz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7773) granting a pension to Missouri Ganson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7774) granting a pension to Bertha Belle Lasley, Ruth Norine Lasley, Wanda Evelyn Lasley, Josephine Lois Lasley, Wilma Henriette Lasley, minor children of William Henry Lasley, deceased; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVILA (by request): A bill (H. R. 7775) for the relief of Sues de L. Villamil & Co., of San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 7776) granting an increase of pension to Mary Trouts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 7777) for the relief of M. Zingarelli and wife, Mary Alice Zingarelli; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 7778) granting a pension to Kit (Christopher) Dougherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7779) for the relief of William H. Wagoner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 7780) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Spellman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7781) granting a pension to Peter M. F. Gallant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7782) granting a pension to Vina Bertch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7783) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Barnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7784) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7785) granting an increase of pension to Melissa Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7786) granting an increase of pension to Samantha J. Wykoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7787) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7788) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7789) granting an increase of pension to Hannah R. Troup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7790) granting an increase of pension to Mathilda M. Bear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7791) granting an increase of pension to Ida V. Brecount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7792) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7793) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7794) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Ingerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 7795) for the relief of Ella S. Brown; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7796) to authorize the payment of certain expenses and disbursements incurred by William A. Brown, William K. Kennedy, and the city of Manila, P. I.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7797) granting a pension to Anna A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7798) granting a pension to Nancy E. Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7799) granting a pension to Nancy J. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7800) granting a pension to Ebbie Allstott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7801) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7802) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7803) granting a pension to Eleanor Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7804) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda C. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7805) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Ingle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7806) granting an increase of pension to Iadna Coward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7807) granting a pension to James A. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 7808) providing for the examination and survey of the Mississippi River in and in the vicinity of Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 7809) granting an increase of pension to Tony Clyde Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 7810) for the relief of Marion M. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7811) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 7812) for the relief of the Security Trust Co. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7813) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7814) granting a pension to Sarah M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Anna E. Casey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7816) granting an increase of pension to Huldai Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 7817) granting a pension to Rebecca Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 7818) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Block; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7819) granting a pension to Drucilla Ellen Petts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7820) granting a pension to Eliza Towell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7821) granting a pension to Rachel F. Burd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7822) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7823) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7824) authorizing the Court of Claims to render judgment in favor of the administrator of or collector for the estate of Peter P. Pitchlynn, deceased, instead of the heirs of Peter P. Pitchlynn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 7825) to correct the military record of Michael S. Spillane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 7826) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Max; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7827) for the relief of R. H. King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 7828) for the relief of William H. Esterbrook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7829) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7830) granting a pension to Nannie Flener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7831) granting a pension to Edgar J. Hobdy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7832) for the relief of Guy R. Conklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 7833) granting an increase of pension to Louis Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7834) granting an increase of pension to Alice Spence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7835) granting a pension to Rosa E. Postel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7836) granting a pension to Mary A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7837) granting a pension to Fred Libbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7838) granting a pension to Mary Demaree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7839) granting a pension to May Yoder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7840) granting a pension to Fannie Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7841) granting a pension to Roy Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7842) granting a pension to Jesse Beason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 7843) granting a pension to Mary De Vos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7844) granting a pension to Hattie F. S. Traver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 7845) for the relief of Paul D. May; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUBBY: A bill (H. R. 7846) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Cansler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 7847) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Reiber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 7848) granting a pension to Emeline E. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 7849) to require the Secretary of War to cause to be made a preliminary examination and survey for an extension of the East Coast Canal of Florida from Miami or Florida City to Key West for the purpose of completing the inside canal and waterway route from New York to Key West via the East Coast Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7850) providing for the examination and survey of the Miami River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7851) granting a pension to Mollie E. Metzler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7852) granting a pension to Virginia E. Esty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 7853) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Hills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7854) granting an increase of pension to Katie McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 7855) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7856) granting a pension to Ida B. Pittenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7857) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Vernatter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7858) granting an increase of pension to Lelia E. Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7859) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Lockbaum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7860) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7861) granting an increase of pension to Martha Queen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7862) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7863) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca G. Irwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7864) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Tinkham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7865) granting an increase of pension to Matilda F. Axline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7866) granting an increase of pension to Anna Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7867) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Gormley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7868) granting an increase of pension to Julia Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7869) granting an increase of pension to Caroline F. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7870) granting an increase of pension to Emma McCameron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7871) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Littlejohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7872) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7873) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7874) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7875) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7876) granting an increase of pension to Josie Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7877) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7878) granting an increase of pension to Mary O'Kane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7879) granting an increase of pension to Esther M. Bunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7880) granting an increase of pension to Maggie A. Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7881) granting an increase of pension to Joanna P. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7882) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Groves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7883) granting an increase of pension to Adell C. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7884) granting an increase of pension to Lavina C. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7885) granting an increase of pension to Addie Hursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7886) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Berkshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 7887) for placing Cadet Adrian Van Leeuwen on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 7888) for the relief of Casey McDannell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 7889) for the relief of William S. Bartlett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 7890) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Ruper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 7891) for the relief of William J. Cocke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7892) for the relief of Mrs. Charles Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7893) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Holtz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7894) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Botts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7895) for the relief of the Lagrange Grocery Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7896) for the relief of Mary F. Crim; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7897) to ratify the action of a local board of sales control in respect of contracts between the United States and the West Point Wholesale Grocery Co., of West Point, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7898) to ratify the action of a local board of sale control in respect of contracts between the United States and the Lagrange Grocery Co., of Lagrange, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 7899) for the relief of George Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

227. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Irrigation Districts Association of California, indorsing the Swing-Johnson bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

228. Also, petition of the Stockton Chamber of Commerce, Stockton, Calif., urging the passage of the Sacramento and San Joaquin flood control bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

229. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition from the citizens of Binghamton, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

230. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of various citizens of West Frankfort, Ill., protesting against any compulsory Sunday observance bill, and especially protesting against the Lankford Sunday compulsory observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

231. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition to Congress protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation by 22 citizens of Clinton, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

232. Also, petition to Congress by 45 citizens of Lockwood, Mo., protesting against the passage of legislation in favor of compulsory Sunday observance, particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

233. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 50 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the defeat of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

234. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Horace Mann and more than 125 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

235. Also, petition of Harriet F. Quigley and 19 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

236. Also, petition of Miss Mildred Carlton and 102 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

237. By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of Martin J. Clayton, of South Coventry, Conn., and others, against compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

238. Also, petition of Charles F. Kingfield and others, against Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

239. Also, petition of French Press, of Willimantic, Conn., and 500 others, against compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

240. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Mercedes, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

241. Also, petition of citizens of Lyford, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

242. Also, petition from citizens of Harlingen, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

243. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Mr. George W. Shields and 25 other citizens of Hillsdale County, Mich., protesting

against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

244. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of A. G. Johnson, S. P. Meade, and other residents of Birmingham, Ala., in opposition to House bill 78, the Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

245. By Mr. KADING: Petition of 80 citizens of Fort Atkinson, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

246. Also, petition of 51 citizens of Jefferson County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

247. Also, petition of 77 citizens of Jefferson County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

248. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Rev. E. O. Valberg, pastor, and 168 voting members of the First Lutheran Church, Lake City, Minn., urging the present immigration quotas be retained, and that the "national-origins" clause in the immigration act be repealed; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

249. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

250. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of J. M. Lowder, Rube Davis, Will Berry, Judge Wood, and 68 other citizens of Neosho, Mo., Fairview, Mo., and surrounding community, praying for the defeat of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

251. By Mr. NEWTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, in opposition to compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

252. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Owners and Tenants Association of the city of New York concerning the erection of a new Federal building in the city of New York and the removal of the old post-office building in said city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

253. Also, petition of the United Spanish War Veterans, national headquarters, Washington, D. C., favoring certain legislation affecting United States war veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

254. By Mr. SCHAFER: Petition of Rho Sigma Phi Fraternity, of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of the development of the St. Lawrence Ship Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

255. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of Indiana County, Pa., against the Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

256. By Mr. WARE: Petition of John S. Murchison and others against House bill 78, the Sunday closing law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

257. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of citizens of the State of New York protesting against the enactment of the compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

258. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of certain citizens of Louisville, Ill., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford bill, Sabbath observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

259. By Mr. WINTER: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by residents of Casper and Big Horn County, Wyo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

260. By Mr. ARENTZ: Memorial of officials of the State of Nevada (the legislature not being in session), asking for the reimbursement of the State for moneys actually advanced and expended by the State in aid of the Government of the United States during the War between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

261. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of National Equal Rights League and Race Congress, on behalf of colored citizens of the United States, for the enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

262. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of citizens of New York State, opposing compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

263. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Mr. George Badt and others, of Farmington, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

264. Also, petition signed by Mr. A. J. Nixon and others, of Tekoa, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory

Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

265. Also, petition signed by Mr. A. P. Johnson and others, of Garfield, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

266. Also, petition signed by Mr. H. W. Hanford and others, of Oakesdale, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, December 17, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God.

Almighty and everlasting God, who art always more ready to hear than we to pray, and art wont to give more than either we desire or deserve, grant to us, Thy children, such a consciousness of Thy indwelling presence as may give us utter confidence in Thee. In all our doubts and perplexities may we throw ourselves upon Thy besetting care, that knowing ourselves fenced about by Thy loving omnipotence we may serve Thee always with singleness of heart. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on the request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 23, 33, and 34, and agreed to the same; that it had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 32 and agreed to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that it further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 19, 36, and 37 to the said bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, provide revenue, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	King	Schall
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard
Bayard	Frazier	McKellar	Shipstead
Bingham	George	McMaster	Shortridge
Black	Gerry	McNary	Simmons
Blaine	Gillett	Mayfield	Smoot
Blaise	Glass	Metcalf	Steck
Borah	Goff	Moses	Stelwer
Bratton	Gould	Neely	Stephens
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Swanson
Broussard	Hale	Nye	Thomas
Bruce	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Pine	Tyson
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Ferris	Keyes	Sackett	

Mr. COPELAND. My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is detained from the Senate, attending the funeral of an intimate friend.

Mr. HOWELL. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT OF PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Library:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Eighth Annual Report of Perry's Victory Memorial Commission for the year ended December 1, 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 17, 1927.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF PORTO RICO

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying reports, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 12 of the act of Congress of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, including the reports of the heads of the several departments of the government of Porto Rico and that of the auditor for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927.

I recommend that the report of the Governor of Porto Rico, without appendixes, be printed as a congressional document.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 17, 1927.

COMPENSATION TO THE RELATIVES OF EDWIN TUCKER (S. DOC. NO. 20)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, concerning a claim against the United States, presented by the Government of Great Britain for compensation to the relatives of Edwin Tucker, a British subject who was killed by a United States Army ambulance in Colon, Panama, on or about December 6, 1924. The report requests that the recommendation as indicated therein be adopted and that the Congress authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to compensate the claimants in this case.

I recommend that in order to effect a settlement of the claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation of \$2,500.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 17, 1927.

CLAIM ON ACCOUNT OF DEATH OF SAMUEL RICHARDSON (S. DOC. NO. 21)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of the matter of a claim against the United States presented by the British Government for the death on November 1, 1921, at Consuelo, Dominican Republic, of Samuel Richardson, a British subject, as a result of a bullet wound inflicted presumably by a member or members of the United States Marine Corps, which formed the subject of a report made by the Secretary of State to me on April 3, 1926, and my message to the Congress dated April 5, 1926, which comprise Senate Document No. 92, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, copies of which are furnished for the convenient information of the Congress.

Concurring in the recommendation made by the Secretary of State, that in order to effect a settlement of this claim the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of \$1,000, I bring the matter anew to the attention of the present Congress in the hope that the action recommended may receive favorable consideration.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 17, 1927.